

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

JUN 18 1954

CONTENTS

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

PAGE

GREENE, R. L.—"The Port of Peace": Not Death but God	307
WHITING, B. J.—Miller's Head Revisited	309
DONALDSON, E. T.—Chaucer's 'Miller's Tale,' A 3483-8	310
FOWLER, D. C.—An Unusual Meaning of "Win" in Chaucer's 'Troilus and Criseyde'	313
SIDE, KARINA—Christopher Smart's Heresy	316
WICKER, C. V.—Byron as Parodist	320
STURTEVANT, A. M.—Concerning Doublet Synonyms in Old Norse	321
POLITZER, R. L.—On the Development of Latin '-ll-' to '-dd-' in Romance	325
CROWLEY, F. J.—The Walther Edition of Voltaire (1748)	331
JACKSON, G. B.—Another Chateaubriand Autograph in London	334
CONNER, WAYNE—Balzac's Frenhofer	335
CARTER, B. G.—The Goncourts' Henriette Maréchal in Mexico	338
BENTLEY, C. A.—Rilke and André Maurois	340
GLASER, EDWARD—Two Anti-Semitic Word Plays in the 'Guzmán de Alfarache'	343
WEIGAND, H. J.—Trevrezent as Parzival's Rival?	348

REVIEWS:—See inside front cover.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

KEMP MALONE, General Editor

DON CAMERON ALLEN
CHARLES R. ANDERSON
ANNA HATCHER
EMILE MALAKIS

WILLIAM H. McCLAIN
GEORGES POULET
ARNO SCHIROKAUER
BRUCE W. WARDROPPER

EARL R. WASSERMAN

The Subscription Price is \$6.00 in the U. S.; \$6.25 in Canada; and \$6.50 in other foreign countries. The price of single issues is \$1.00.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editor of *Modern Language Notes*, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 18, Md. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In preparing manuscripts, contributors are requested to follow the *MLA Style Sheet*.

Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Maryland.

CONTENTS—Continued

REVIEWS:—

ALEXANDER JÓHANNESSON, <i>Isländisches etymologisches Wörterbuch</i> . [G. S. Lane]	357
R. F. JONES, <i>The Triumph of the English Language</i> . [James Sledd]	361
KENNETH SISAM, <i>Studies in the History of Old English Literature</i> . [H. B. Woolf]	363
HEINZ REINHOLD, <i>Humoristische Tendenzen in der englischen Dichtung des Mittelalters</i> . [R. H. Llewellyn]	366
BEATRICE D. BROWN et al., <i>Ninth Supplement to a Manual of the Writings in Middle English 1050-1400</i> . [T. A. Kirby]	367
PAUL CHRISTOPHERSON, <i>The Ballad of Sir Aldingar, its Origins and Analogues</i> . [Stith Thompson]	368
W. F. SCHIRMER, <i>John Lydgate</i> . [T. A. Kirby]	370
RAYMOND PRESTON, <i>Chaucer</i> . [H. R. Patch]	371
G. H. GEROULD, <i>Chaucerian Essays</i> . [H. R. Patch]	374
D. F. SMITH, <i>Critics in the Audience of the London Theatres from Buckingham to Sheridan</i> . [G. W. Stone, Jr.]	375
A. VARTANIAN, <i>Diderot and Descartes</i> . [Georges May]	376
P. N. DUNN, <i>Castillo Solórzano and the Decline of the Spanish Novel</i> . [B. W. Wardropper]	379

BRIEF MENTION: CHR. HARTLICH und W. SACHS, <i>Der Ursprung des Mythosbegriffs in der modernen Bibelwissenschaft</i> ; JAMES H. BALTZELL, <i>The Octosyllabic Vie de Saint Denis</i> ; A. H. DIVERREB, <i>Froissart: Voyage en Béarn</i>	380
---	-----

CORRESPONDENCE: The "Epistola a Mateo Vázquez"; Istos Ympnos Ludendo Composuit	390
--	-----

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

S

new
the
and
ted
hna

57
61
63
66
67
68
70
71
74
75
76
79
80
80

view
ulti-
and
sted

hna

357

361

363

366

367

368

370

371

374

375

376

379

380

380

Modern Language Notes

Volume LXIX

MAY, 1954

Number 5

"THE PORT OF PEACE": NOT DEATH BUT GOD

None of the poems in the late Carleton Brown's *Religious Lyrics of the Fifteenth Century* appears to have made a stronger impression on reviewers than the eight lines from British Museum MS. Royal 9. C. ii to which he gave the title "Death, the Port of Peace":¹

Howe cometh al ye That ben y-brought
In bondes,—full of bitter besynesse
of erthly luste, abydyng in your thought?
Here ys the reste of all your besynesse,
Here ys the porte of peese, & resstfulnes
to them that stondesth In stormes of dys[e]se,
only refuge to wrech In dystrese,
and all comforte of myschefe & mys[e]se.

In his introduction he wrote:²

Still more unmistakable testimony [than that of the preceding poem, which ignores the terrors of death and emphasizes the hope of heaven] to the changing tone in the fifteenth century appears in the 8-line stanza . . . In the lines

Here ys the reste of all your besynesse,
Here ys the porte of peese, & resstfulnes—

we recognize clearly the spirit of the Renaissance. At the threshold of the sixteenth century we are already looking forward to Spenser.

The anonymous reviewer in *The Times Literary Supplement* selected the verses for special mention, quoting and endorsing

¹ (Oxford, 1939), No. 164, p. 259. The poem was previously printed by Brown in *A Register of Middle English Religious & Didactic Verse* (Oxford, 1916), I, 363, where it was dated "Early XVI cent." and noted as in the hand of Thomas Lower. It is entered as No. 1254 in Brown and Robbins's *Index of Middle English Verse* (New York, 1943).

² P. xxix.

Brown's comment.³ In my own review I expressed my admiration for the poem and agreed with Brown's point of the continuity of medieval and Renaissance lyric tradition.⁴ Sir Walter Greg reprinted the whole piece and expressed doubts of its editor's interpretation, saying: ⁵

There is here no mention of death, and it would be possible to see in 'the porte of peese' no more than a state of grace or even the sanctuary of the church. Be this, however, as it may, the poem was well worth preserving for its own sake.

Neither Brown nor any of the reviewers seems to have recognized that the "lyric" is a translation and slight expansion of the opening lines of Meter 10 in Book III of Boethius's *Consolation of Philosophy*, which read, in a contemporary text: ⁶

Huc omnes pariter venite capti:
Quos fallax ligat improbis catenis
Terrenas habitans libido mentes
Hic erit vobis requies laborum
Hic portus placida manens quiete.
Hoc patens vnum miseris asilum

It is, in fact, from the translation of the whole work made by John Walton, Augustinian canon of Oseney Abbey, in 1410, which has been edited by Mark Science from some sixteen manuscripts and the printed edition of 1525.⁷ The text printed by Brown contains several readings which show it to be nearer to the printed edition than to the manuscripts collated by Science. The stanza, incidentally, is not exempted from Science's severe comment on Walton's treatment of the *metra* in general: "Except for an occasional tinge of alliterative colouring Walton's *metra* are painted in the same drab tones as his renderings of the *prosa*, and the varying rhythms of the original are reduced to the monotonous beat of the iambus."⁸

Although there is in this stanza no sign of the heavy dependence on Chaucer's translation which Walton frequently shows, it may be well to append here Chaucer's "Glose" on the passage: ⁹

³ Oct. 28, 1939, p. 628.

⁴ *MLN*, LV (1940), 309.

⁵ *RES*, XVI (1940), 198.

⁶ (Lyons: Jean Dupré, 1489).

⁷ *EEES*, O. S., CLXX, 1927.

⁸ P. lxi.

⁹ *The Complete Works*, ed. F. N. Robinson (Cambridge, Mass., 1933), p. 412.

This to seyn, that ye that ben combyrd and disseyvid with worldly affections, cometh now to this sovereyn good, that is God, that is refut to hem that wolen come to hym.

We must, then, cease to regard the poem as a lyric on mortality. Whatever our subjective response to its verbal grace, we must acknowledge its context and date and grant to its substance the highest degree of earlier medieval currency and of acceptance as Christian orthodoxy.

RICHARD L. GREENE

California Institute of Technology

MILLER'S HEAD REVISITED

Several years ago *Modern Language Notes* published three comments on the pachycephaly of Chaucer's Miller:¹

There was no dore that he nolde heve of harre,
Or breke it at a rennyng with his heed (*CT* I[A], 550-551).

Examples of men with heads as hard and spirits as willing as the Miller's were cited from sources as separated in time as Synesius's *Calvitii Encomium* and *The New Yorker*, and Professor Utley wisely suggested that the peculiarity is too frequently found in the world of the side-show to make further parallels other than otiose. Nevertheless, one need hardly apologize for calling attention to a contemporary of Chaucer who can match the Miller, especially since we find a more or less scientific explanation of the phenomenon. Our evidence comes from one of Trevisa's additions to his translation of Higden's *Polychronicon*. Higden has been discussing people born with unusual tooth and bone formation and Trevisa breaks in:

Som men telleþ þat som man in Irlond hap oon boon al hool in oon side instede of all his ribbes; and Thomas Hayward of Berkeley hap in þe

¹B. J. Whiting, "The Miller's Head" (*LII* [1937], 417-419); A. N. Wiley, "The Miller's Head Again" (*LIII* [1938], 505-507); F. L. Utley, "The Last of the Miller's Head" (*LVI* [1941], 534-536). Another example of human "head-bumping" as an exhibition is recorded in Herman Melville's *White Jacket* (1850), *Works*, Standard Edition, London, 1922, vi, 345-6.

molde of his heed, pol and forehead, but oon boon al hool; perfore he may wel suffre grete strokes aboue on his heued, and busche azenst men and horshedes, and breke strong dores wiþ his heed, and hit greueth hym nouȝt.²

Trevisa completed his translation in 1387 and not long before the passage just quoted he had indicated that he was writing in 1385. Someday, perhaps, a happy scholar may demonstrate that Thomas Hayward was a Gloucestershire miller who, as weary of his craft as the Reeve seems to have become of carpentering, came up to London, procured employment in the Customs, and entertained his fellow bureaucrats at the expense of the king's property. A cursory glance through the indexes of the Close and Patent Rolls for the period shows no Thomas Hayward, no matter how the last name be spelled, to our purpose, although the memorable page³ which prints the letters patent for Chaucer's annual butt of wine also carries the name of a Thomas Hayward. He appears, to be sure, only as a witness to an indenture dated at Caresbrok in the Isle of Wight a couple of years earlier, but perhaps the juxtaposition, though meaningless in itself, may be a good omen for future investigations.

B. J. WHITING

Harvard University

CHAUCER'S *MILLER'S TALE*, A 3483-6

Jhesu Crist and seinte Benedight,
 Blesse this hous from every wikked wight,
 For nyghtes verye, the white *pater-noster*!
 Where wentestow, seinte Petres soster?

Manly and Rickert observe that until this "charm is better understood we cannot be sure of several words, as the scribes were obviously puzzled."¹ It is of course possible that John the carpenter had no idea what his charm meant, and even that Chaucer

² *Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden Monachi Cestrenses: Together with the English Translations of John Trevisa and of an Unknown Writer of the Fifteenth Century*. Edited by Churchill Babington and J. R. Lumby, 8 vols., Rolls Series, London, 1865-82, II (1869), 189-91.

³ *Calendar of the Patent Rolls: Richard II*, VI, 1396-1399, p. 420.

¹ *The Text of the Canterbury Tales* (Chicago, 1940), III, 441.

wasn't entirely sure either: it was only important that the guardian spirits should understand. Therefore I trust it would in no way offend them to suggest, in trying to rescue one of the charm's words from scribal and talismanic obscurity, that the spirits understood Old English.

The third line contains a word that has been printed by Robinson (see above), by Skeat, and by the *Globe* editors, as *verye*, but by Koch and by Manly and Rickert as *uerye*.² The meaning of the word is uncertain: Skeat suggested that *for nyghtes verye* might represent OE *for nihte werigum*, "against the evil spirits of the night"; and Thoms sought to connect *verye* with *Wera*, *Werre*, the name of a witch in German legend.³ In either case, however, a difficulty is raised by the interchange of *v* and *w*, which, while common in Scotland, is unlikely in either Chaucer's or John's dialect.⁴ Another possibility is suggested by the reading of the MSS followed by Koch and by Manly and Rickert. While the great majority read *verye* and a few others have the eccentric forms *verray*, *varie*, *werry*, *warye*, *mare*, *mere*, seven MSS, Hg Bo² El Ad³ Hk Lc Mg, which represent at least four independent lines of transmission, give the form that has been read as *uerye*.⁵ The initial letter is interesting: normally, of course, initial *u* and *v* are both represented scribally by *v*, and the two-minim initial ordinarily represents *n*, not *u*. On the face of it, one would expect the combination of two minims plus *-erye* to give *nerye*, and I wonder whether that was not what O¹ really did intend.⁶ *Nerian*, "to save," is, of course, common in OE in theological associations: compare *Ner(i)gend*, "the Savior."⁷ The *NED* does not, however, list the verb, which apparently went out of currency with the Conquest. Nevertheless, it might well have been preserved in charms such as the carpenter's, which has all the earmarks of being an ancient one, or at least a recollection of an ancient one. Observe particularly *Benedight*, representing the normal development of

² *Idem.*, p. 142.

³ See Robinson's note in his *Complete Works of Chaucer*, p. 788.

⁴ Jordan, *Handbuch der Mittelhochdeutschen Grammatik* (2d ed.: Heidelberg, 1934), § 163.

⁵ All MSS-readings are from Manly and Rickert, III, 142, and V, 346.

⁶ The forms *mare*, *mere*, if not merely wild glosses, also suggest a misreading of a two-minim initial.

⁷ See Bosworth-Toller under words cited.

the Latin *Benedictus* which was used by OE writers, generally displaced in ME by the French forms *Beneit*, *Benet*. And, as is well-known, the personified Pater Noster plays a part in the OE *Solomon and Saturn*.⁸

If one may read an initial *n*, then the line—which in any case seems to require a verb—means, “May the White Pater Noster save (us) from (the perils of the) night.” I take *nerye* to be the third person singular of the present subjunctive, a form in which the *i*-suffix of verbs of the first weak OE class would normally be preserved into ME of the South and West.⁹ Since the OE verb is transitive, the lack of an expressed object is difficult if one assumes that Chaucer knew exactly what John was saying, but the object may be taken to be implicit in the *hous* (in turn implying its inhabitants) of the preceding line; or alternatively, if Chaucer remembered the charm phonetically rather than by its sense, *nyghtes* might be taken as reflecting an original *night us*. As it stands, *nyghtes* seems to be a generalized plural meaning “night-time,” or nights collectively;¹⁰ it is governed by the preposition *for* meaning “as a precaution against”¹¹—or, as we should say, and some of the scribes did say,¹² “from the night.” ME idiom would, in this context, require the El reading *For nyghtes*, preferred by Robinson, Koch, Skeat, and the *Globe*, rather than Hg *For the nyghtes*, preferred by Manly and Rickert. It is possible that the definite article was introduced by scribes who assumed that *nyghtes* was a genitive modifying a following noun.

The emendation by no means clears up all the problems the charm presents. Nor is it itself entirely certain. But it seems better to prefer a reading that conforms with scribal practice and

⁸ Ed. R. J. Menner (New York, 1941).

⁹ Samuel Moore, *Historical Outlines of English Sounds and Inflections*, rev. by A. H. Marckwardt (Ann Arbor, 1951), pp. 119, 122, 124, says that in the South the *i*-suffix was preserved through the 13th century and in Kent even later, but in the West was displaced before the end of the 12th; but the B-text MSS of *Piers Plowman* show preservation well into the 15th century in certain areas of the South and West.

¹⁰ See *NED*, *nights*.

¹¹ See *NED*, *for*, prep., 23, d.

¹² For the preposition, Cn En¹ Fi Ha⁴(2) Ld¹ Py read *fro*; Te² *from*; the rest *for*. The definite article is omitted by Cx¹ Dl El Ha⁴ He Ii Ne Te² To. Uninflected *nyght* is given by Bo¹ Cn Fi La Lc Ma Mg Ph² Ra¹.

that has some etymological respectability to even more uncertain *verye* or *uerye*—perhaps ghosts of a sort never imagined by carpenter John.

E. T. DONALDSON

Yale University

AN UNUSUAL MEANING OF "WIN" IN CHAUCER'S *TROILUS AND CRISEYDE*

In a familiar passage in Book One of Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde* Troilus, having just returned from the temple where he first saw the lovely Criseyde, meditates in the privacy of his chamber. He has begun to realize that he is in love, and now makes up his mind to cast aside all self-deception and to pursue love's craft:

And over al this, yet muchel more he thoughte
What for to speke, and what to holden inne;
And what to arten hire to love he soughte,
And on a song anon-right to bygynne,
And gan loude on his sorwe for to wyne;
For with good hope he gan fully assente
Criseyde for to love, and nought repente.¹

Attention is invited to the italicized line (390), and particularly to the use of the verb *wyne*. No one, so far as I know, has suggested that there is anything unusual in the force of *wyne* in this passage, and yet any one of the commonly accepted meanings, if applied here, raises serious difficulties. The stanza quoted above has been translated by J. S. P. Tatlock and P. MacKaye (in *The Modern Reader's Chaucer*, New York, 1912) as follows:

And he thought of much more,—what to speak, what to hold in, and how to bring her to love him. So he straightway began to indite a song, and to triumph over his sorrow, and with good hope he fully assented to love Criseyde and not repent.

Again, G. P. Krapp, in his metrical translation (New York, 1932), has:

¹ I, 386-392, quoted from *Works*, ed. F. N. Robinson (Boston, 1933), p. 458.

Yet more than this—he gave much careful thought
 On what to speak and when he should hold in,
 And plans for leading her to love he sought,
 And thought, a poem straight he would begin
 Upon his love, *as aid her love to win*;
 For now his highest hope was set and bent
 On ways to love—too late now to repent!

It will be noted that in neither case is the word *loude* translated.² Herein lies the difficulty. How can Troilus *win loudly*? Or, following Tatlock and MacKaye, how can he *triumph loudly*?

As a solution to this problem I wish to submit evidence in support of an unusual meaning for *wynne* as it is used in the above passage. Briefly, I believe that the word is here best translated "complain," and that *wynne* in this sense represents a special semantic development in Middle English from the Old English verb *winnan*.

It is, of course, well known that one common meaning of OE *winnan* is "strive" or "contend," and, further, that this meaning survives on occasion in Middle English.³ That OE *winnan* ever had the force of "complain" is doubtful, but one passage in the Old English *Genesis A* does come close to such a meaning. In the paraphrase of *Gen 16:4-5* (*Genesis A* 2237-52) Hagar is represented as vexing Sarah with insults (*æþancum*). She is not disposed to endure servitude, but rather she begins boldly to contend (*winnan*) against Sarah. Sarah then appeals to Abraham, saying that Hagar has vexed her daily with deeds *and words* (*dædum and wordum*). I do not insist that the use of *winnan* here is exceptional, but simply point out that the notion of "contending with words" is present, and suggest that this may be an early stage in the development of the special meaning "complain" in Middle English.

² R. M. Lumiansky, in *Geoffrey Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde Rendered into Modern English Prose* (University of South Carolina Press, Columbia, 1952), p. 12, translates lines 389-390 as follows: "Immediately he began a song and sang loudly to overcome his sorrow." There is, of course, no authority in the original for the word "sang," which Mr. Lumiansky supplies.

³ Bosworth and Toller, *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, p. 1234, *winnan*, esp. A II. For Middle English, consult *OED*, *win* v.¹ esp. 1. Cf. the passage on the whale's nature in the Middle English *Bestiary*, British Museum MS Arundel 292: "sumer and winter winnen." A part of this older meaning seems to have survived in the modern phrase "win out."

The crucial question, however, is this: does this rare use of *wynne* occur elsewhere in Middle English? One example, I believe, can be found in Passus 4 of *Piers the Plowman*. It will be recalled that Peace has come into parliament and put up a bill against Wrong. Wrong sees that the case is going against him, and appeals to Wisdom and Wit for help.

*Wyssdom wan tho, and so dede Wyt also,
For that Wrong hadde wrought so wykkide a dede,
And warnide Wrong tho, with suche a wys tale: **

Skeat's glossary, in the *EETS* edition, provides the meaning "went," "went forward" for *wan* in this context, referring to a Lowland Scottish use of *win*.⁵ Later, in the glossary for his *Parallel Texts* (II, 458), he lists the meaning as "strove," "disputed," citing OE *winnan*. Finally, in his modernization of the B-text, Skeat translates *wan* as "awoke."⁶ A careful reading of the above passage will, I think, convince anyone that we have here another use of *wynne* in the sense of "complain" or, perhaps more accurately in this case, "remonstrate." In reply to Wrong, Wisdom remonstrated (*wan*) *with words* which are quoted in lines 56-59.

Returning to the original passage in *Troilus and Criseyde*, we can now see that there is justification for translating Chaucer's *wynne* as "complain." There is no difficulty if we understand that Troilus has begun to *complain loudly* on his sorrow. Furthermore, in the succeeding stanzas (following the brief reference to Lollius, lines 393-99), Troilus does exactly that, *with words*, in the *Canticus Troili*.

DAVID C. FOWLER

*University of Washington,
Seattle, Wash.*

* A-text, 4.53-55, quoted from *Piers the Plowman. A Critical Edition of the A-Version*, ed. T. A. Knott and the present writer (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1952), p. 94. Cf. p. 196 of this edition for variant readings on this passage. Apparently many A-scribes failed to understand the use of *wan* in A 4.53. A similar misunderstanding is evident in MSS of *Troilus and Criseyde*. See R. K. Root's edition (Princeton, 1926), p. 21, where some MSS are listed as having "þo to wynne" or "therto wynne" instead of "for to wynne."

⁵ *EETS* O. S. No. 81 (London, 1884), p. 800. Skeat refers only to B 4.67, since his A-text had *wente* (following the Vernon MS) instead of *wan*.

⁶ London, Chatto and Windus, 1905, p. 58.

CHRISTOPHER SMART'S HERESY

In his edition of Smart's poems Robert Brittain calls attention to a curious feature of Smart's theology which he calls his "concept of the tri-partite nature of man."¹ He assumes that this must have grown out of Smart's interest in angelology and belief in the existence of individual tutelary angels, which he may have derived from Matthew xvi. 10: "Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you, that in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my father which is in heaven." Mr. Brittain continues, "That this theory developed in his mind into a clear doctrine of trichotomy (a heresy, incidentally) is shown conclusively in his poem on the Holy Trinity (Hymn xvi):

Man, soul and angel join
To strike up strains divine;
.
.
.
For angel, man and soul
Make up upon the whole
One individual here,
And in the highest sphere;
Where with God he shall repose,
From whose image first he rose.—St. 5 and 6."

He relates this in turn to *A Song to David*, xlii, "Man's made of mercy, soul and sense," where "mercy" is equivalent to "angel" as in Hymn vi 'The Presentation of Christ in the Temple,' St. 16.

I have no wish to dispute Mr. Brittain's excellent interpretation but I think two of his assumptions need correcting, viz. that the idea was heretical, and (as his remarks seem to imply) that it was a theological aberration peculiar to Smart.

I have found no evidence to corroborate Mr. Brittain's statement that the conception of a human trichotomy was or is a heresy in the Church of England. Argument from negative evidence is notoriously vulnerable, but in this case it seems particularly suggestive when we find, for instance, as will appear below, that the idea of trichotomy of a sort occurs in the writings of St. Augustine without producing any imputation of heresy. Indeed, his nineteenth century translator, A. W. Haddan, points out how

¹ Brittain, *Poems by Christopher Smart*, 1950, pp. 287-288.

carefully Augustine avoids the charge: "He is careful not to deal with these analogies or images [i. e. analogies to the Holy Trinity taken from man] as if they either constituted a purely argumentative proof or exhausted the full meaning of the doctrine, upon both which assumptions such speculations have at all times been the fruitful parent both of presumptuous theorizing and of grievous heresy."² Similarly A. W. Hopkinson classed William Law's slightly different idea of trichotomy "under the head of theological speculations,"³ that is, without authority but not necessarily heretical. In the nineteenth century it was even assumed that St. Paul believed in a trichotomy of man,⁴ though it is only fair to say that the assumption has been questioned in more recent times.⁵ The heresy then, it appears, would be to use analogies as arguments, or, in the words of Bishop Kaye, to think "that whatever may be truly predicated of the illustration, may be predicated with equal truth of that which is was designed to illustrate."⁶ Smart gives no indication that he intended his idea to be used in this way.

The particular combination of elements in Smart's trinity is unusual, but, as is already apparent, the idea of man as an image of the Holy Trinity is itself an old one. There was a good patristic tradition for the practice of finding analogies to the Holy Trinity in the triune nature of man. St. Augustine provided the seminal instances with his analogies drawn from the functioning of man's consciousness, such as that of being, self-knowledge and love of one's being and knowledge: "nam et sumus, et nos esse novimus, et id (nostrum) esse ac nosse diligimus."⁷ He himself considered most satisfactory the analogy in the fourteenth book of *De Trinitate*: "mens meminit sui, intelligit se, diligit se: hoc si cernimus, cernimus trinitatem; nondum quidem Deum, sed iam imaginem Dei."⁸ This very trio of memoria, intelligentia and amor was adopted by Anselm,⁹ and the practice of finding psychological analogies to the Trinity became common among the Fathers.

² Haddan, *The Works of Aurelius Augustine*, vii, 1873, p. vi.

³ Hopkinson, *About William Law*, 1948, p. 100.

⁴ See J. T. Beck, *Outlines of Biblical Psychology*, 1877, J. B. Heard, *Tripartite Nature of Man*, 1866.

⁵ See F. Townley Lord, *The Unity of Body and Soul*, 1929.

⁶ John Kaye, *Works*, i, 1888, pp. 409-410.

⁷ Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, x, 26.

⁸ *De Trin.* xiv, 11.

⁹ Anselm, *Monologium*, lxvii.

It is clear, however, that Smart had a rather different image in his mind; his triad is not, like Augustine's, made up of three inter-related faculties of man, but of three distinct entities, "man, soul and angel." I think this combination was suggested by another theory altogether, that of the "chain of being" linking all creation. As Professor Lovejoy has shown,¹⁰ man's position was thought to be in the middle of this chain, as "the horizon and boundary line of things corporeal and incorporeal,"¹¹ the link between angels and beasts. The natural corollary of this was to think of man as having something of each kind in his own nature. Indeed, the idea of man's mixed nature, part angel, part beast, became a commonplace of thought, and had found its way into literature, and even into religious verse, long before Smart. It was, for instance, the subject of Herbert's poem 'Man's Medley':

To this life things of sense
Make their pretence:
In th' other Angels have a right by birth;
Man ties them both alone,
And makes them one,
With th' one hand touching heav'n, with th' other earth.

Even if Smart had not read Herbert in the original, he could have met this poem in John Wesley's version:

This Life belongs to Things of Sense,
Justly to this they make Pretence;
Angels possess the next by Birth:
Man, grov'ling glorious Man alone
Angel and Brute unites in one,
While this Hand Heav'n, that touches Earth.¹²

Or if he had gone further afield he could have found the same idea in Edward Benlowes' *Theophila* (1652):

Had we no bodies, we were angels; and
Had we no souls, we were unmann'd
To beasts: (Canto I, xxxi).

It still remained for the two ideas, of man as a trinity and of man's mixed nature, to be amalgamated, but even here Smart was not first in the field. We find the ideas side by side in the writings

¹⁰ Lovejoy, *The Great Chain of Being*, 1936, p. 189 ff.

¹¹ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Contra Gentiles*, II, 68, quoted Lovejoy, *op. cit.*, p. 79.

¹² Wesley, *Hymns and Sacred Poems*, 1739, p. 64.

of a contemporary of Smart's, a clergyman, Philip Skelton. In his *Controversial Discourses* (1754), Discourse XXXII on 'The Progress of Man' Skelton shows his acquaintance with the theory of the chain of being "wherein the lower is always linked to that above by somewhat common to the nature of both";¹³ man, consequently, is suspended between his angelic nature on one hand, and the brutish on the other.¹⁴ Then in his Discourse on 'The Doctrine of the Holy Trinity vindicated' he argues that "The gracious Being, foreknowing our utter incapacity of conceiving him, as he is himself, hath provided such resemblances of himself in the works of his creation, as do aptly and sufficiently represent him to us." Hence, to help us to believe in the distinction of persons in the Trinity, "there are three essences of natures united in that of man; the vegetative, the animal, and the angelic nature, which constitute one individual man." And again: "what is a person? Is it not a human creature, consisting of an angelic or rational spirit, an animal soul, and an organized body?"¹⁵ The similarity of this to Smart's idea is striking; both were surely expressing the same basic idea, not so much a theological oddity as a perfectly rational extension of current beliefs.

I should just mention in conclusion that the idea of man as a trinity had other champions in the eighteenth century. As Dr. Bett has observed, the belief is frequently expressed in the hymns of the Wesleys that regenerated man would be, like unfallen man, an image of the Trinity.¹⁶ The idea, as Charles Wesley acknowledged, was derived from William Law,¹⁷ and is to be found also in the writings of his disciple, John Byrom.¹⁸ Dr. Bett traces it ultimately to Boehme, by whom Law was deeply influenced. This is evidently quite a different idea from Smart's, and though he may have been aware of it, he does not appear to have incorporated it into his own beliefs.

KARINA SIDE

Oxford University

¹³ Skelton, *Works*, I, 1824, p. 367.

¹⁴ *Op. cit.*, II, 280.

¹⁵ *Op. cit.*, II, 278-279.

¹⁶ Bett, *The Hymns of Methodism*, Revised edn., 1945, pp. 121-123.

¹⁷ Especially in *The Grounds and Reasons of Christian Regeneration*, 1739, and *An Appeal to all that Doubt, or Disbelieve the Truths of the Gospel*, 1756.

¹⁸ See "An Epistle to a Gentleman of the Temple."

BYRON AS PARODIST

Byron's fondness for parody and his skill in this art have attracted little if any attention, yet a number of his short poems, mostly occasional pieces, are parodies, and he used parody as a satirical method in many incidental brief passages in the longer poems from *English Bards* on.

For example, two of his verses to his publisher Murray, "Strahan, Tonson, Lintot of the Times" and "For Orford and For Waldegrave," are parodies of William Cowper's "To Mary," as the quotation of a stanza from each of the three poems demonstrates. First, Cowper's sincere tribute to his old friend:

The twentieth year is well-nigh past
Since first our sky was overcast;
Ah! would that this might be the last!
My Mary!

Next, the earlier of the two parodies:

Strahan, Tonson, Lintot of the times,
Patron and publisher of rhymes,
For thee the bard up Pindus climbs,
My Murray.

The other one is Byron's reply, dated August 23, 1821, to Murray's offer of £2,000 for *Sardanapalus*, *The Two Foscari*, and three cantos of *Don Juan*:

For Orford and for Waldegrave
You give much more than me you gave;
Which is not fairly to behave,
My Murray!

The stanza is the same, and the play on Mary and Murray is typical, as is the switch from Cowper's pathos and tenderness to mocking selfishness and gentlemanly greed, not obscuring Byron's genuine, if business-like, regard for the recipient. The full effect of the parody requires a complete reading of all three poems.

Another parody is Byron's imitation of Boileau's epigram on Corneille

Après l'Agésilas,
Hélas!
Mais après l'Attila,
Holà!

in the following verses, sent to Thomas Moore, March 25, 1817, with the comment, "Here are some versicles, which I made one sleepless night":

I read the *Christabel*;
 Very well:
 I read the *Missionary*;
 Pretty—very:
 I tried at Ilderim;
 Ahem!
 I read a sheet of *Marg'ret of Anjou*;
 Can you?
 I turn'd a page of Webster's *Waterloo*;
 Pooh! pooh!
 I look'd at Wordsworth's milk-white *Rylestone Doe*;
 Hillo!
 I read *Glenarvon*, too, by Caro. Lamb—
 God damn!

Besides these, the following are also obvious parodies: "Who Kill'd John Keats?," "What News, What News? Queen Orraca," "When Thurlow This Damn'd Nonsense Sent," "To Lord Thurlow," "Ballad; To the Tune of 'Sally in Our Alley,'" "Another Simple Ballad," "New Song to the Tune of 'Whare Hae Ye Been A' Day,'" "Bowles and Campbell," "The New Vicar of Bray," and "Epilogue" ("There's something in a stupid ass"). And, of course, *The Vision of Judgment* is both great satire and great parody, the culmination of Byron's use of the *genre*.

C. V. WICKER

University of New Mexico

CONCERNING DOUBLET SYNONYMS IN OLD NORSE

I

Máni : Tungl 'Moon'

ON *tungl* was originally used in the generic sense of 'a heavenly body, *Gestirn*,' as is attested by its cognates in Gothic and WGmc,¹

¹ Cf. *Goth. uf tugglam* (Gal. 4.3) as a marginal gloss for *uf stabim* (ὁπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα) 'among the elements' = 'the stars'; OE *tungol* : OS

but was applied specifically only to the two most important heavenly bodies, viz. the sun and the moon. It was apparently first applied to the sun since this sense is restricted to poetry.² Here the word *tungl* was never used as a synonym for *sól* 'sun,' but only in the generic sense of 'a heavenly body' as applied to the sun since it also could be applied to the moon. In later prose usage, however, the word *tungl* became restricted to the specific sense of 'the moon,' whereby it lost its original generic sense of 'a heavenly body' and became a synonym for *máni* 'moon.' This particularization of sense was peculiar to ON, for in all the other OGmc dialects the cognates of ON *tungl* still retained the original generic sense of 'a heavenly body.' I venture to suggest that this semantic divergence in ON was due to the tendency for new synonyms to fall into the pattern of doublet synonyms.

Before the time when the word *tungl* became restricted to the specific sense of 'moon' there already existed the pattern of doublet synonyms for 'sun,' viz. *sól* : *sunna*, but no synonym for *máni* 'moon.' A particularization of sense in *tungl* from the generic sense of 'a heavenly body' was necessarily in favor of either *sól* 'sun' or *máni* 'moon.' It seems then plausible to assume that the lesser heavenly body (*máni* 'moon') followed the pattern of the greater heavenly body (*sól* 'sun') by the addition of a (new) synonym *tungl*, whereby the pattern of doublet synonyms was established for both heavenly bodies (i. e., *máni* : *tungl* 'moon' parallel to *sól* : *sunna* 'sun'). An additional synonym for *sól* (*sunna* : *tungl*) would have violated this pattern, and perhaps this was the reason why *tungl* became synonymous with *máni* 'moon' and not with *sól* 'sun.'

tungal : OHG *zungal*, all in the sense of 'heavenly body.' In WGmc the word usually occurred as the second component of a compound the first element of which was the word for 'heaven'; cf. OS *himil*, *heðan-tungal* : OHG *himil-zungal* = ON *himin-tungl*. Gering assumes (*Kommentar zu den Liedern der Edda*, I, 53) that the simplex form does not occur in OS and OHG ("Im alts. und ahd. ist das simplex nicht belegt . . ."). This is not true of the OS; cf. *Heliand*, 600 (*tunglun*) and 3627 (*tungle*).

² Cf. *Völuspá* 40, 7, *tungls tjágari* 'robber of the sun.' In skaldic kennings the word *tungl* was often used in its original generic sense without reference in particular to either the sun or the moon; cf. *tungla hvalf* 'house of the heavenly bodies' = 'the heavens,' *tungla stýrir* 'ruler of the heavenly bodies' = 'god.'

II

Pý(r) : Ambótt 'Maid Servant'

The ON word *ambótt* belongs to that group of loan words which were borrowed from the Celtic during the prehistoric era. The Latinized form of the Celtic prototype of *ambótt* was *ambact-us*, masc. *o*-stem, 'male servant.'³ The Latin masculine *o*-stem *ambact-us* corresponds to a Proto-Germanic **ambaht-az*, which is reflected in both Gothic and WGmc; cf. Gothic *and-bahts* (reformed from **am-bahts*), WGmc: OHG *ambaht* : *ampaht*, OE *ambeht* (with *-e-* borrowed from *ambeht* < **ambeht-ja* 'Amt, office'), OS *ambahteo* (with shift of declension into the *jan*-stems). Therefore, we should have expected an ON form **ambátt-r* (< **ambaht-ar*) meaning 'male servant,' on a level with the other OGmc dialects, as derived from the Proto-Germanic form. Instead, we find that the Proto-Germanic form **ambaht-az* suffered a shift of gender into the feminine *ō*-stems: **ambaht-ō* > **ambaht-u* > **ambōht-u* > *ambótt* > *ambótt* > later variant forms *ambátt*, *ombótt*. Perhaps the reason for this shift of gender in ON may be explained according the pattern of doublet synonyms. In the synonyms under discussion there is no clear distinction between 'servant' and 'slave.' I shall therefore use the word 'servant' throughout.

At the time when the word *ambactus* was introduced in its Proto-Germanic form **ambahtaz* > PN **ambahtar* there already existed in PN the pattern of doublet synonyms for 'male servant' in the two native words corresponding to the historical forms *þræll* : *þjónn*.⁴ The word *þræll* was never applied specifically to a female servant, and Gothic *þius* (= Runic *þewar* > **þér*) 'male servant' survived only in proper names (cf. *Sig-*, *Ham-*, *Egg-der* [< **-þér*]). On the other hand, there existed before the time when **ambaht-ar* was introduced into PN only one native word for 'female servant,' viz. **þiwīr* (cf. Gothic *þiwi*) > *þír* > *þý(r)*. There

³ Cf. Paulus and Festus: "Ambactus apud Ennium lingua gallica servus appellatur."

⁴ For the synonymous usage of *þræll* : *þjónn* cf. "þvíat hómom fylgia / fimm ambóttir / átta þjónar . . ." (*Sigurdarkviða* 70, 1-2) with the corresponding prose passage: "hon lét drepa þrælla sína átta ok fimm ambóttir" (*Guðrúnarkviða* I, 29).

is no evidence that the word *mær* 'maiden' ever had the sense of 'maid servant,' as did Gothic *magaps* and its WGmc cognates (cf. Germ. *Magd*). It seems then perfectly possible that the shift of gender from masculine to feminine in PN **ambaht-ar* > **ambaht-u* was due to the fact that the feminine form furnished a synonym for **þiwīr*, i. e., **þiwīr* : **ambaht-u* > *þý(r)* : *ambótt* 'female servant,' parallel to *þræll* : *þjónn* 'male servant,' thus preserving the established pattern of doublet synonyms. An additional synonym **ambáttr* (< **ambaht-ar*) for 'male servant' would have violated this pattern. Similarly, we may assume that the word *mær* 'maiden' never acquired the sense of 'maid servant' because there already existed the doublet synonyms *þý(r)* : *ambótt* for 'female servant' and therefore an additional synonym would have violated the established pattern of doublet synonyms for 'male servant' (*þræll* : *þjónn*).

So far as I know, no attempt has ever yet been made to explain the semantic divergence from the other OGmc dialects in ON *tungr* 'moon' and *ambótt* 'female servant.' But it is significant that the problem has never been approached from the viewpoint of synonyms. The evidence which I have advanced, while far from furnishing a proof, seems nevertheless to support the hypothesis that we have here to do with analogical patterns. In the case of *tungr* 'heavenly body' the analogical pattern *máni* : *tungr* 'moon' followed the established pattern *sól* : *sunna* 'sun,' the other principal 'heavenly body'; and in the case of *ambótt* 'female servant' the analogical pattern *þý(r)* : *ambótt* followed the established pattern *þræll* : *þjónn* 'male servant,' the opposite sex. The two words, *tungr* and *ambótt*, were in a sense new synonyms in that *tungr* acquired the specific sense of 'moon' at a comparatively late period and in that *ambótt* was a loan word which according to the evidence in the other OGmc dialects must in Proto-Germanic have represented the masculine gender and hence originally (in PN) could not have been a synonym for **þiwīr* > *þý(r)* 'female servant.'

ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT

University of Kansas

ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF LATIN -ll- TO -dd-
IN ROMANCE

The development of Latin -ll- to a cacuminal -dd- (*maxilla* > *maziḍḍa*, *gallus* > *ḡaḍḍu*) is a very typical feature of Sardinian, Southern Italian and Sicilian consonsonantism.¹ In some parts of Southern Italy we find for the -ll- also the reflexes *d*, *ḍ*, *g*, *γ*, which are most likely further developments of -dd-.² The development -ll- > -dd- is also found in parts of Corsica and it appears sporadically in the Northwestern part of Tuscany.³ It probably existed at one time also in the Gascon-Aragonese area where the present reflexes of Latin -ll-, namely -ts-, -t-, -r-, etc. can be explained as derivations from -dd-.⁴

The -ll- > -dd- development has been a widely debated point in historical Romance phonology. The substratum theorists, such as Millardet, Wagner, or von Wartburg, oppose those who, like Rohlfs, feel that the change should be explained by a purely external phonetic evolution. The substratists point to the presence of emphatic consonants in possible substratum languages, for the Semitic and also the Berber languages oppose generally normal stops to emphatic stops, produced with the tongue drawn back against the palate with the tip simultaneously retroflexed. They also point to a general "*recul d'articulation*" which can be detected in the pronunciation of some sounds in Sardinian, Sicilian and

¹ For a map of the -ll- > -dd- change see Walter von Wartburg, *Die Ausgliederung der romanischen Sprachräume* (Bern, 1950), Map. 1.

² See G. Rohlfs, *Historische Grammatik der italienischen Sprache*, Vol. I (Bern, 1950), pp. 387 ff., von Wartburg, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

³ For -ll- > -dd- in Corsica see Helmut Schmeck, "Probleme des korsischen Konsonantismus," *ZRPh*, LXVIII (1952), 49-71. For the Tuscan phenomenon see G. Rohlfs, "Alttertümliche Spracherscheinungen in der Garfagnana," *ZRPh*, LXII (1942), 81-87. Rohlfs makes it clear that the change in the Garfagnana affects chiefly the definite article and also initial *l*. Von Wartburg, *op. cit.*, p. 6, suggests that the isolated appearance of -dd- in Tuscany is due to importation from Corsica during the Middle Ages.

⁴ See G. Rohlfs, "Zur Entwicklung von -ll- im Romanischen," *Festschrift für Eduard Wechssler*, Jena und Leipzig, 1929, pp. 388-401. *Le Gascon* (*Essai de Philologie pyrénéenne*), Beiheft zur *ZRPh* 85, (Halle, 1935), p. 102. W. D. Elcock, *De Quelques Affinités entre l'aragonais et le béarnais* (Paris, 1938), pp. 178 ff.

Corsican, and which can supposedly be connected with a Mediterranean substratum.⁵ Against this the anti-substratum theory can point to the existence of cacuminal sounds in many unrelated languages, the possibility of a purely external evolution from Latin double *-ll-*⁶ and the comparatively late date at which the *-ll- > -dd-* development is first attested.⁷

In this article we shall try to contribute to the solution of the problem by considering it within the framework of the consonant structure of the dialects in which it chiefly occurs.

In Sardinian the Latin unvoiced stops are generally preserved in initial position. If they are intervocalic, in the word or in the sentence, they tend to undergo weakening to voiced sounds of fricative nature. The extent of this weakening varies from one dialect to the other: it is absent in Bitti and Baronia, in Nuorese affects *-t-* only, and in Logudorese and Campidanese affects all the unvoiced stops.⁸

In Sardinian the voiced stops of Latin are also preserved in initial position. If they are intervocalic in either the word or the sentence, they appear in some dialects (Bitti, Nuoro, Orani) as voiced continuants (*videre > biðere, tibi > tiði, iugum > iuɣu*) and in others (Dorgali, Logudorese, Campidanese) they fall completely (*striga > stria, coda > coa, etc.*).⁹

The Latin intervocalic geminates, voiced or unvoiced, are preserved. The Sardinian intervocalic geminates may thus be derived either directly from Latin (cf. *addormentarsi*, AIS 648) or may be created by assimilation (*freddo*, AIS 387).

In Sicily and Southern Italy the Latin unvoiced stops are for the most part preserved. Latin voiced stops appear in most areas initially as well as intervocalically as voiced continuants: *bibere > Bere, dare > rare, credo > crero* (with a change *d > ð > r*), *gallo > ɣaðɔ, augusto > aɣosto*).¹⁰ The intervocalic geminates are pre-

⁵ G. Millardet, "Sur un ancien substrat commun à la Sicile, la Corse, et la Sardaigne," *RLiRom*, ix (1933), 346-369. M. L. Wagner, *Historische Lautlehre des Sardischen*, Beiheft zur *ZRPh*, No. 93 (Halle, 1941), pp. 270 ff., von Wartburg, *op. cit.*, pp. 5-6.

⁶ Rohlfs, *Historische Grammatik der italienischen Sprache*, pp. 387 ff.

⁷ The first testimony of the *-ll- > -dd-* change from Sardinia does not antedate the Fourteenth Century (Wagner, *op. cit.*, par. 346.).

⁸ Wagner, *op. cit.*, par. 99 to par. 106.

⁹ Wagner, *op. cit.*, par. 118 to par. 122.

¹⁰ The examples are quoted from L. A. Ondis, *Phonology of the Cilentan*

served as in Sardinian. Voiced stops thus appear generally only if they are geminates. Standard Italian words borrowed into the dialect usually geminate their voiced stops in order to adapt themselves to the structure of the dialect: *nobile* becomes *nobbile*, *buono* becomes *bbuono*. In the process of initial gemination typical for many Southern Italian dialects the voiced continuant is converted into a double stop: *lo vedi* becomes *lo bbedi*.¹¹

The last mentioned point is of particular importance. For it underlines the fact that in those dialects the contrast of double to single in the intervocalic series tends to become double voiced stop to single voiced continuant (bb:β, dd:ð, gg:γ). In spite of wide dialectal divergencies, this is one feature shared by most of Sardinian, Sicilian and Southern Italian. The same contrast of double stop to single continuant brought about by the preservation of Latin geminates and spirantization of the Latin intervocalic voiced stops appears also in Southern Corsica, which is also the part of Corsica where the -ll- > -dd- development can be found.¹²

How are we to explain then the -ll- > -dd- change? Evidently the contrast of double voiced stop to single voiced continuant tended to extend itself to the other voiced phonemes. In case of the nasals, it must be remembered that they are pronounced with some closure of the oral passage in any case, and they possess—like the double trill *rr*—certain stop characteristics. In the case of the -ll- the tendency toward articulation as a double stop could make itself felt most obviously: the -ll- sound produced with an occlusion formed by the tongue against the palate turns automatically into a cacuminal -dd-.

Throughout the area of the -ll- > -dd- change, single intervocalic

Dialect, (New York, 1932). See also H. Lausberg, *Die Mundart Südlukaniens*, Beiheft zur ZRP No. 90 (Halle, 1939). For a general discussion of Southern Italian and Sicilian consonantism, see Rohlfs, *Historische Grammatik der italienischen Sprache*, Vol. I, passim. In some areas, full articulation of voiced stops is restored or perhaps retained. Other reflexes of Latin voiced stops are geminate voiced stops and in some instances unvoiced stops. See also various maps of the AIS such as *i denti* 107, *i piedi* 103, etc.

¹¹ Rohlfs, *op. cit.*, p. 292.

¹² See Schmeck, *op. cit.* Northern Corsican voices Latin intervocalic unvoiced stops to voiced stops thus reintroducing voiced intervocalic stops into the consonant pattern.

-l- tends to undergo certain transformations such as shifts to *w*, *γ*, *δ*, *β*.¹³ All of these can be explained by the emphasis on the continuant qualities of the lateral *l*. One might say that the evolution of the -*ll*- > -*dd*- is caused by the full exploitation of the inherent stop possibilities of the liquid and the changes affecting the single -*l*- by the exploitation of the inherent continuant possibilities. It seems then that the changes are basically related and part of the adaptation of the *ll:l* contrast to a double stop: single continuant structure.

The trigger mechanism responsible for the -*ll*- > -*dd*- change is thus a development which seems at first quite unrelated, namely the spirantization of Latin intervocalic voiced stops which, by simultaneous retention of the geminates creates the *bb:β*, *dd:δ*, and *gg:γ* contrasts.. Form this point of view it is quite interesting to consider briefly the conditions which probably accompanied the appearance of the -*ll*- > -*dd*- development in the Gascon-Aragonese area. The spirantization of Latin intervocalic stops or their complete effacement is of course characteristic for practically all of Spain, France and Northern Italy. Structurally this spirantization seems part of a chain reaction which simplifies the geminates, voices the intervocalic unvoiced stops: *tt* > *t*, *t* > *d*, *d* > *δ*.¹⁴ In other words while spirantization of the intervocalic voiced stops takes place, new intervocalic voiced stops (from the Latin unvoiced stops) take their place. Yet there is within the Western Romance world one area in which the Latin voiced stops spirantize without any accompanying voicing of the Latin unvoiced stops. This area is precisely the Gascon (Béarnais) and High Aragonese territory on both sides of the Pyrenees.¹⁵ There the spirantization of Latin voiced stops is evidently not part of the chain reaction process characteristic of the rest of the Western Romance world. Not only did the voicing of intervocalic unvoiced stops not affect this area, there is also some evidence that the simplification of geminates in

¹³ Rohlfs, *op. cit.*, pp. 316 ff., Wagner, *op. cit.*, pp. 126 ff., Lausberg, *op. cit.*, pp. 104 ff.

¹⁴ See A. Martinet "Celtic Lenition and Western Romance Consonants," *Language*, xxviii (1952), 192-218.

¹⁵ See A. Kuhn, "Der Hocharagonesische Dialekt," *RLiRom*, xi (1935), pp. 72 ff., W. D. Elcock, *op. cit.*, passim, and for a summary of the problem of the retention of Latin intervocalic unvoiced stops in that area, von Wartburg, *op. cit.*, pp. 32-33.

that territory was a comparatively late process.¹⁶ This means that until the simplification of geminates took place in the Gascon-High Aragonese area their dialects offered the same structural conditions which, as we have pointed out, seemed to have favored the *-ll-* > *-dd-* change in the Southern Italian, Sicilian and Sardinian dialects. The further developments of *-dd-* in Aragonese and Gascon are also of interest. They can be accounted for either by the fall of the final vowel, which put the *-dd-* combination into the word final position where it unvoiced in accordance with the general tendencies of Provençal or Aragonese: *castellum* > *casteddo* > *castets*. Developments like *bello* to either *bero* or *beto*¹⁷ on the other hand, seem to be connected with the simplification of *dd* into a system which does not tolerate voiced intervocalic stops. The development of *-dd-* > *-r-* preserved the voiced quality of the *-dd-* combination while the *-t-* outcome preserves the stop quality with a simultaneous "compulsory" unvoicing.

I do not think, then, that the *-ll-* > *-dd-* change can be explained by substrata or at least certainly not by reference to substrata alone, without recourse to a consideration of the total consonant structure. Even if we admit the possibility that perhaps the Berber or Semitic languages or some unknown Mediterranean substratum possessing emphatic consonants may have played a part in the *-ll-* > *-dd-* development, the question remains why cacuminalization should have had such a vogue in precisely the *-ll-* combination,¹⁸ and why just *-ll-* should have been transformed into a stop articulation.

The real reasons for the *-ll-* > *-dd-* change, I wish to suggest, are then the factors which in Sicily, Southern Italy, Sardinia, and

¹⁶ A statistical examination of the Late Latin (mostly 11th Century) texts published by R. Menéndez-Pidal in his latest edition of the *Orígenes del Español* (third edition, Madrid, 1950), reveals that simplification of geminates must have proceeded from West to East at a comparatively late date. The Leonese documents show simplification of geminates in 58% of all instances while the corresponding figure for the Aragonese documents is 9%.

¹⁷ See Rohlfs, "Zur Entwicklung von *-ll-* im Romanischen," p. 392, and *Le Gascon*, p. 102; Elcock, *op. cit.*, pp. 117-179 and 183-186.

¹⁸ Millardet, *op. cit.*, finds evidence for cacuminalization also in some other sounds. This seems to strengthen the substratum aspect. It is also possible, of course, that cacuminalization, once it occurred in the *-ll-* combination, may have spread from there to other sounds in the system.

temporarily at least in the Gascon-Aragonese area, led to the double stop: single continuant pattern by replacing the Latin voiced stops intervocalically by continuants. An exhaustive discussion of these reasons would go far beyond the scope of this article, but I should like nevertheless to mention what I picture these reasons to be, in order to show that the structural explanation of a comparatively small detail like the *-ll- > -dd-* change necessarily leads into a wider and larger context.

As Martinet has shown in a recent study, the entire Latin consonantism underwent first a weakening and subsequently a strengthening of articulation during its archaic period.¹⁹ Sardinian, it seems, inherited an archaic Latin pattern. Initial voiced stops are restored to full stop quality, but intervocalically the voiced stops continue in weakened continuant form. The widespread replacement of Latin initial as well as intervocalic stops in Southern Italy and Sicily, on the other hand, appears to be connected with the centuries of symbiosis of Latin and Greek in those areas. For in its postclassical period, Greek replaced its voiced stops by continuants, in some dialects perhaps as early as the Fifth Century B. C.²⁰ The spirantization of Latin intervocalic voiced stops in the dialects on both sides of the Pyrenees, finally, seems to have some connection with Basque. It seems likely that Basque at one time possessed a consonant pattern which in intervocalic position knew only voiced continuants.²¹ At any rate, this type of pattern emanating from the Basque territory as a starting point, became eventually established in many areas of the Iberian Peninsula, including Castile.

The above mentioned theories are of course meant only as suggestions. The important point in connection with our argument here is that the structural conditions which favored the *-ll- > -dd-* shift evidently occurred in the areas under discussion for totally different reasons. The discussion of the *-ll- > -dd-* change once

¹⁹ A. Martinet, "Some Problems of Italic Consonantism," *Word*, vi (1950), 26-41.

²⁰ Michel Lejeune, *Traité de phonétique grecque* (Paris, 1947), pp. 45 ff.; A. Thumb, *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte*, second edition (Heidelberg, 1937), pp. 84-87 and p. 90.

²¹ See A. Martinet, "De la Sonorisation des occlusives initiales en Basque," *Word* vi (1950), 224-234. *Idem*, "The Unvoicing of the Old Spanish Sibilants," *Romance Philology*, v (1951-52), 135-156, esp. p. 146.

more emphasizes a methodological axiom, which still—no matter how often it has been stated before—seems in need of constant repetition: in dealing with a linguistic phenomenon one should first examine all the possibilities of explanation which exist within the structure of the language in which it occurs. Only after these possibilities have been exhausted does it seem permissible to consider outside influences, especially if the latter are of highly hypothetical nature.

ROBERT L. POLITZER

Harvard University

THE WALTHER EDITION OF VOLTAIRE (1748)

Algarotti was apparently the agent who made this edition possible and who served to bring the author and the Royal Printer, George Conrad Walther, together. The edition has been described by Bengesco, under 2129, but rather inadequately, as will be seen below. I shall point out some uncollected material as well.

Volume I.

In the unpaginated *Préface de M. de Marmontel* to the *Henriade*, the following *alinea*, immediately preceding the final paragraph therein, is missing in Moland:

"C'est là ce que j'avois à dire sur cette nouvelle édition de la *Henriade*. Le grand nombre de vers qu'on y trouve nouvellement ajoutés, et l'attention avec laquelle elle a été faite, font présumer favorablement du succès.

Quant à ce que etc."

Volume II.

Mélanges de littérature et de philosophie.

1. *De la gloire ou entretien avec un Chinois.*
2. *Du suicide, ou de l'homicide.*
3. *De la religion des Quakers* (followed by appropriate titles for the rest of the table of contents of the *Lettres Philosophiques*, which title is discreetly not mentioned at all.)

Remarques sur les pensées de M. Pascal.

Lettre de l'auteur à M. de S'Gravesende, professeur de mathématique.

Lettre sur les inconvénients attachés à la littérature.

Fragment d'une lettre sur la corruption.

Copie d'une lettre à un premier commis.

Remarques sur l'histoire.

Nouvelles considérations sur l'histoire.

Discours sur la fable.

Courte réponse à un long discours d'un docteur allemand.

Relation touchant un Maure blanc.

Lettre sur l'esprit.

Discours sur le fanatisme.

Discours sur le déisme.

Discours sur les contradictions de ce monde.

Discours sur ce qu'on ne fait pas et ce qu'on pourroit faire.

Lettre sur Messieurs Jean Law, Melon et Dutot.

Seconde lettre sur le même sujet, dans laquelle on traite des changements dans les monnoyes, du luxe des peuples et du revenu des rois.

Anecdotes sur le czar Pierre le grand.

Essai sur le siècle de Louis XIV (five chapters in all).

Lettre de M. de Voltaire sur son Essai du siècle de Louis XIV à Mylord Harvey, garde des sceaux privé d'Angleterre.

Anecdotes sur Louis XIV.

Volume III.

Beuchot to the contrary notwithstanding, the reading to which Voltaire objected in his letter to Chabanon on December 18, 1767 does exist here (III, 336), namely: "De l'infortuné Créateur." It was therefore repeated in later editions.

Volume IV.

Since the last paragraph of the "Avis de l'éditeur en 1743" prefatory to *Le Fanatisme ou Mahomet le prophète* differs in several respects with the text as given in Moland I shall give it here:

Quelques personnes ayant transcrit à la hâte plusieurs Scènes aux Représentations (sic), et ayant eu un ou deux Rôles des Acteurs, en ont fabriqué les Editions qu'on a faites clandestinement. Il est aisé de voir à quel point elles diffèrent du véritable ouvrage que je tiens de la main d'un homme irréprochable, ainsi que les autres Pièces (sic) que je donne dans l'Edition présente. La plus curieuse, à mon gré, est la Lettre que l'Auteur écrivit à Sa Majesté le Roi de Prusse, lorsqu'il repassa par la Hollande, après être allé rendre ses respects à ce Monarque. C'est dans de telles Lettres, qui ne sont pas d'abord destinées à être publiques, qu'on voit les véritables sentimens (sic) des hommes. Celle que j'ai eue encore d'un ami de feu Mr. de s'Gravesande est de ce genre. J'espère qu'elle fera aux véritables Philosophes le même plaisir qu'elle m'a fait.

Both Moland and Bengesco seem to have neglected the "Avertissement" which here (IV, 109) precedes the preface to *Hérode et Mariamne*. It runs as follows:

La *Mariamne* fut jouée en 1723 pour la première fois. Baron, qu'on a surnommé Aesopus des Français, joua le Rôle d'Hérode; mais il étoit

trop vieux pour soutenir ce caractère violent. Adrienne le Couvreur, la meilleure Comédienne qui ait jamais été, représenta Mariamne. L'Auteur faisoit mourir cette Princesse par le poison, et on le lui donnoit sur le Théâtre. C'étoit vers le tems des Rois que la Pièce fut jouée. Un Petit-Maitre dans le Parterre, voyant donner la coupe empoisonnée à Mariamne, s'avisa de crier, *la Reine boit*. Tous les Français se mirent à rire, et la Pièce ne fut point achevée. On la redonna l'année suivante. On fit mourir Mariamne d'un autre genre de mort. La Pièce eut 40 Représentations.

Le Sr. Rousseau, qui commençoit à être un peu jaloux de l'Auteur, fit alors une Mariamne d'après l'ancienne Pièce de Tristan; il l'envoya aux Comédiens, qui n'ont jamais pu la jouer, et au Libraire Didot, qui n'a jamais pu la vendre. Ce fut là l'origine de la longue querelle entre notre Auteur et Rousseau.¹

Volume vi.

Bengesco, in his table of contents to this volume, omits mention of seventy "figures" illustrative of the *Newton* text and which appear after the "table des matières." His "Lettre sur le chancelier Roger Bacon" should read "Lettre sur le moine Roger Bacon" as Voltaire correctly has it.

Volume ix.

Beuchot in his note to the "Ode à M. le duc de Richelieu sur l'ingratitude," accepted by Moland, suggests that though this poem appears in the Dresden 1752 edition "il doit y avoir eu des éditions antérieures." It is in fact found in this volume, p. 203 sq. and the volume bears the date 1750.

Volume x.

Data not found in Moland are the dates here assigned to the following poems:

Epître à M. le président Hénault

à Lunéville, ce 28 novembre 1748

(Réponse) à Monsieur le Cardinal Quirini²

à Berlin ce 12 décembre 1751

¹ See Paul Bonnefon, "Une inimitié littéraire au XVIII^e d'après des documents inédits," *RHL*, ix, 547 sq. He says: "Sur les marges d'un exemplaire de ses œuvres de l'édition de 1738-39, en face d'un passage où il est dit que l'origine de la querelle fut Marianne, une tragédie de Rousseau, Voltaire a écrit de sa propre main: "Cela n'est pas vrai. L'origine de la querelle est une pièce de vers infâmes que Rousseau fit contre M. le maréchal de Noailles. Je sais qu'il a fait une Marianne (*sic*), mais je ne l'ai jamais lue. Voltaire."

² See Moland x, 357.

The "Pièces diverses" include:

- 1.) *Pensées sur le gouvernement.*
- 2.) *Pirronisme (sic) de l'Histoire.*
- 3.) *Examen du testament politique du cardinal Albéroni.*
- 4.) *Des Cérémonies.*

The Dialogues are:

- 1.) *Dialogue entre un plaideur et un avocat (sic).*
- 2.) *Dialogue entre Mme de Maintenon et Mlle de l'Enclos.*
- 3.) *Dialogue entre un philosophe et un contrôleur-général des finances.*
- 4.) *Dialogue entre Marc-Aurèle et un Récollet.*

FRANCIS J. CROWLEY

University of California,
Los Angeles

ANOTHER CHATEAUBRIAND AUTOGRAPH IN LONDON¹

Ever since M. Beau de Loménie's article appeared in 1925 it has been known that Chateaubriand, while he was in exile in London, received a money grant from the Literary Fund.² M. Beau de Loménie's very interesting article gives some of the details of this incident, and a brief account of the admirable society that helped the great writer in his distress. The society, known nowadays as the Royal Literary Fund, is still in existence. M. Beau de Loménie drew his information from the register which has been kept ever since its early years. But there exists also, preserved in the Royal Literary Fund's archives, a document of some interest that M. Beau de Loménie does not appear to have seen, a document hitherto unpublished, and which the society's Hon. Secretary, Mr. J. C. Broadbent, has very kindly allowed me to reproduce here. It is an acknowledgement, in Chateaubriand's hand, of his receipt of the Royal Literary Fund's grant-in-aid. Scrawled on a small sheet of paper, it is couched in the following terms:

Monsieur

à mon retour en ville, j'ai trouvé les dix guinées que Messieurs les mem-

¹ See *Modern Language Notes*, November, 1952.

² See *Revue de littérature comparée*, vol. v, p. 486: *Chateaubriand et le Literary Fund*.

bres de la société du fonds littéraire ont bien voulu me faire remettre par les mains du Rev. M. D. Williams, et j'ai l'honneur de leur en adresser mes remerciemens respectueux.

J'ai l'honneur d'être avec respect Monsieur,

Votre très
humble et très
obéissant serviteur
Chateaubriand

M. Beau de Loménie, in the article referred to above, remarks that it was the émigré journalist Peltier who proposed Chateaubriand's case to the Literary Fund, and suggests that the rather ungracious references to Peltier made by Chateaubriand in the *Mémoires d'outre-tombe* may have found their justification in some trickery of Peltier's over the affair. Chateaubriand's acknowledgement seems to prove that he received the full ten guineas awarded to him, and that Peltier did not keep the money, or any part of it, for himself; the reason for the irritation Peltier seems to have inspired in Chateaubriand must therefore be sought elsewhere. It is possible, for instance, that Peltier did not consult Chateaubriand before approaching the Literary Fund on his behalf. Or it may be simply that in the *Mémoires d'outre-tombe* Chateaubriand showed a little of the resentment a benefactor so often arouses in those he helps.

G. B. JACKSON

University of London

BALZAC'S FRENHOFER

It is well-known that Balzac sought significant names for his characters, and that one of his procedures was to modify the names of the persons who served in some way as his prototypes. Among the still unexplained names is that of the artist Frenhofer (*Le Chef-d'œuvre inconnu*, 1831). I should like to propose an "etymology," which may also help establish the literary source for his story.

Of the four artists of the story, only one, the main character Frenhofer, is fictional; the other three are Porbus (1570-1622), Poussin (1594-1665), and Mabuse (Jan Gossaert, c. 1478-c. 1532). As usual, Balzac has blended history and fiction; so, for example, Poussin's part in the story (his mistress, etc.) seems to be pure

invention,¹ while Frenhofer on the other hand, has some basis in fact. The old painter is presented as the benefactor and only pupil of Mabuse. In exchange for the money to gratify his passions, this dissolute but talented painter had taught Frenhofer the secret of making life-like paintings. As an instance of this talent, Balzac has Porbus tell how Mabuse once deceived nearly every one when he appeared, at a reception honoring Charles-Quint, in a costume of white paper he had skilfully painted to resemble cloth—he had sold the cloth provided for him by his patron, instead of making a suit with it. This anecdote has often been related, following Van Mander.² Balzac's immediate source was probably a work by J. B. Descamps,³ a copy of which is listed in the catalog of

¹ Mary Wingfield Scott, *Art and Artists in Balzac's "Comédie Humaine"* (University of Chicago Libraries, 1937), p. 22. In this abridged form of her doctoral dissertation, Miss Scott discusses this story at some length, but does not comment on Frenhofer's name—beyond observing that he is a "fictional" character (p. 2).

² *Dutch and Flemish Painters*. Trans. from the *Schilderboeck* and introd. by Constant van de Wall (New York, 1936), p. 102. The *Schilderboeck* first appeared in 1604.

³ *La Vie des peintres flamands, allemands et hollandais, avec des portraits gravés en taille-douce, une indication de leurs principaux ouvrages, & des réflexions sur leurs différentes manières*, 4 vols. (Paris, 1753-1764). Pp. 83-85 of vol. I are devoted to Jean de Mabuse. Descamps hardly deviates from Van Mander (whom he cites): e. g., Mabuse was the first to introduce, from Italy, the right way to paint nudes (Balzac has the pupil Frenhofer paint a nude as his masterpiece; this choice of subject suggested the character Gillette); Mabuse painted a fine *Adam and Eve*: during his imprisonment (apparently caused by his debauchery) in Middelbourg, Mabuse made many fine drawings in black crayon (in Balzac the *Adam and Eve* has become an *Adam*, in Frenhofer's possession, which Mabuse painted to get out of debtors' prison).

Balzac's source must be taken into account in discussing the chronology of the story. M. Fernand Lotte has recently commented (*Dictionnaire biographique des personnages fictifs de la "Comédie humaine"* [Paris, 1952], p. 664, note 41) that Balzac's chronology is incorrect, for Frenhofer in 1612 would have to be at least 95 years old (Frenhofer is Mabuse's pupil, and Mabuse died in 1532). Certainly Balzac is sometimes inaccurate or inconsistent in his dates. But in this story he can escape that criticism if we assume that he accepted not the more accurate 1532, but 1562 as Mabuse's death date—1562 is the date given by Descamps (also by M. Marcel Bouteron in his note to the Conard edition). Balzac's formulation, then, is credible enough: in 1612 (in that year Poussin came to

books sold after his wife's death.⁴ At the time of the paper-painting incident, Mabuse was in the service of "le marquis de Veren." Frenhofer derives from this historical personage, and his name as clearly stems from Veren. The change Veren > Fren- is probably a phonetic transcription (Flemish v = French f) rather than a modification of the type Merville > Derville.

The second element *hof* reflects, I believe, Balzac's indebtedness for his plot to E. T. A. Hoffmann's short story *Der Baron von B.*,⁵ which in French translation (with the more specific title *L'Archet du baron de B.*) was printed on Balzac's own press in 1828.⁶ The stories are strikingly similar, both in detail and in outline. In each story, an old, rich, eccentric, who has a fine knowledge of his subject, entertains and even instructs other experts; is the only remaining pupil of a great master whose secret he claims to have; thinks he performs well but doesn't; makes a young beginner prove his skill, and even pays him for his demonstration. There is no doubt that Balzac has improved upon his model and made his eccentric a truly tragic figure. By complicating the plot (Poussin's mistress Gillette) and making art, not music, the specialty,⁷ he has made his borrowing less obvious. But the general "hoffmannesque" quality of Frenhofer remains unmistakable (note also that Balzac first subtitled his story "conte fantastique").

Frenhofer, then, is an appropriate name for a composite character: < Veren + Hoffmann's unnamed eccentric. The final element (Frenhofer) is perhaps due to an assimilation to Fraunhofer, the German optician and physicist (1787-1826). Certainly such an

Paris), Frenhofer is "un vieillard," Poussin "un jeune homme," and Porbus "âgé de quarante ans environ." But it is still a tight squeeze to fit in Charles-Quint!

⁴ Part of item 161 (the author is not named) in the *Catalogue d'une partie de la bibliothèque de Madame Veuve Honoré de Balzac* (Paris, 1882).

⁵ Now, with the title *Der Schüler Tartinis*, at the end of the third part of *Die Serapionsbrüder*.

⁶ Pierre-Georges Castex, *Le Conte fantastique en France de Nodier à Maupassant* (Paris, 1951), p. 45. After some comment on the similarities of the two stories, M. Castex concluded: "Balzac s'est peut-être souvenu de ce conte lorsqu'il décrivit l'aventure tragique et dérisoire de Frenhofer." The "perhaps" of this most recent opinion seems over-cautious.

⁷ Cf. "... *Conti*, c'est Sandeau en musicien, comme *Lousteau* est encore Sandeau." (*Lettres à l'Etrangère*, II, 160).

assimilation (which may have developed directly from Fren-, the pertinence of the *hof* being recognized afterwards) would not be surprising, in view of Balzac's interest in science.⁸ And it is worth noting that Taine once inadvertently referred to Balzac's painter as "Frauenhofer."⁹

To sum up: Frenhofer < Veren + Hoffmann(esque) + Frauenhofer.

WAYNE CONNER

Washington University, St. Louis

THE GONCOURTS' HENRIETTE MARÉCHAL IN MEXICO

Of the many turbulent audiences that have added drama to first night performance in the French theatre, none perhaps has surpassed in unwarranted violence the one which hissed and hooted the Goncourts' three-act play, *Henriette Maréchal*, at its first performance at the Théâtre-Français, December 5, 1865.¹

The Goncourts, always hyper-sensitive to the reception accorded their works at home or abroad,² apparently never learned that their *Henriette Maréchal* was published serially in 1866 (January 18,

⁸ See, for example, *La Peau de chagrin*, which, like *Le Chef-d'œuvre inconnu*, first appeared in 1831.

⁹ *Nouveaux Essais de critique et d'histoire*, 7 ed. (Paris, 1901), p. 78.

Could the lines of dots with the dedication, in the 1845 edition of *Le Chef-d'œuvre*, possibly be a humorous echo of Fraunhofer's "lines" in the spectrum?

¹ The six stormy performances (Dec. 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 1865) of this work have been studied in detail by M. Fuchs ("La Cabale d'Henriette Maréchal," *Mélanges Lanson*, Paris, 1922) who concludes that the "cabale" was "encouragée sous main par le parti de l'Impératrice, en haine de la Princesse Mathilde," p. 392, who had sponsored the work. The *Journal* entry of Dec. 6 reports: "Le chef de claqué m'affirme que, depuis *Hernani* et les *Burgraves*, le théâtre n'a jamais vu de tumulte semblable." Cf. also *Journal* entries of Dec. 7, 9, 11, 14, 15, 17, 23, 26-28.

² Edmond observes that the adaptation of their *Charles Demailly*, a failure on the French stage, was performed seven times at St. Petersburg in Russia "avec le plus grand succès." Edmond affirms he is informed that "ces sept représentations à Saint-Petersbourg équivalent à cent cinquante représentations à Paris." *Journal* ix, 119.

19, 20, 25-30, February 1-4, 7-8) in *l'Estafette*, a French daily of Mexico City. The play and the drama relating to its brief but stormy stage history captured the interest of the editors who included comments concerning it in the numbers dated February 3, 6, 7, 28, March 3 and 6. On February 28, *l'Estafette* published Théophile Gautier's prologue to the play.

All the comments published by *l'Estafette* were contributed by the paper's Paris correspondents whose identity is not made known. The editorial staff did not choose to give its own views of the play and of the rancors its performances revealed, nor did it publish any comments which would imply that political pressures had been responsible for banishing *Henriette Maréchal* from the boards.³ We may assume however that the editors were well posted on the performances by their correspondents and by the papers and journals received.

Why did *l'Estafette* publish *Henriette Maréchal*? An obvious answer is suggested in the interest that groups of recently transplanted French people and other Europeans would take in any development which stirred intense excitement in Paris. Conceivably however there is also a second answer involving a hidden motive. *L'Estafette* was a firm supporter of French intervention and of Maximilian. In the number of May 8, 1866, Charles de Barrès, editor of the paper, writes: "Il était de notoriété publique à Paris, vers la fin de décembre, que l'évacuation du Mexique par nos troupes avait été décidée par le gouvernement français." On April 24, 1866, an unidentified writer comments as follows on the decision of the French government, made known on April 5, to withdraw its troops from Mexico: "Notre départ n'est désiré, n'est espéré, que par ceux qui en attendent le retour de la situation, triste pour le pays, profitable pour eux, à laquelle nous avons mis fin. . . ."

It is not improbable that the *Estafette*, critical of the still unannounced decision to abandon the Mexican venture, interpreted the violent reception given to *Henriette Maréchal* as a disapproval of Napoleon III and his policies, and in wishful thinking included

³ For the general public, the demonstrations against *Henriette Maréchal* represented an expression of political protest against the government and its policies. "La représentation d'une œuvre patronnée par la propre cousine de l'Empereur était une occasion trop belle pour qu'on la laissât échapper." M. Fuchs, *op. cit.*, p. 392.

among the latter as an unpopular policy the projected withdrawal of French troops. If this assumption is valid, the publication of *Henriette Maréchal* was motivated, at least in part, by political intentions.

It is curious and ironical that this work by the Goncourts, "qui s'étaient toujours tenus à l'écart de la politique,"⁴ and who dedicated their energies solely to their ambition to be "des hommes de lettres," should become a symbolical focus for the venting of political animosity, partisan spleen, personal rancor and petty jealousy.

BOYD G. CARTER

University of Nebraska

RILKE AND ANDRÉ MAUROIS

In *Les Nouvelles Littéraires* of March 1, 1951, André Maurois wrote about his novel *Terre Promise* as follows:¹

. . . mais je ne suis pas très content de mon poète: Christian. Je vois de quoi il est fait. Des souvenirs de Rilke, et aussi de Valéry, sont entrés dans sa composition, mais je crains qu'il ne soit pas, aux yeux du lecteur, un être de chair, ce qu'étaient Rilke et Valéry.

Replying to a few questions, M. André Maurois answered me in a letter of October 28, 1953.

Je réponds à vos questions en suivant votre ordre. Oui, j'ai connu Rilke.²

⁴ François Fosca, *Edmond et Jules de Goncourt*, Paris, 1941, p. 207. The author takes this opportunity to express his appreciation to the University of Nebraska's Research Council for the financial aid which made this research possible.

¹ André Maurois, *Terre Promise*, (Editions de la Maison Française: New York, 1945), (Flammarion: Paris, 1946). I quote from the first edition.

² There is not much about André Maurois in Rilke's correspondence. I give two passages, both not very important. In an unpublished letter of November 30, 1923, to Madame Baladine Klossowska, which she showed me in Paris, Rilke wrote:

Les poésies de Maurois (qui ne veulent être que des improvisations flottantes), me semblaient au fond tout aussi bonnes que la prose du colonel Bramble; car on ne peut pas dire qu'elles soient mauvaises, seulement de là à son Ariel, c'est bien loin, et il doit avoir fait du chemin depuis la guerre.

In a letter of February 25, 1924, he advises the princess of Thurn und Taxis to read *Ariel*.

Eine geradezu wunderbare Monographie Shelley's liegt vor: *Ariel ou la vie de Shelley*, von André Maurois; die stünde dann an erster Stelle. Rainer Maria Rilke und Marie von Thurn und Taxis, *Briefwechsel*, (Zürich, 1951), pp. 787-788.

Il était l'ami de mon ami Charles du Bos et nous nous sommes souvent rencontrés chez celui-ci.³ L'idée d'utiliser Rilke et Valéry pour construire le poète de mon roman, m'est venue parce que l'un et l'autre avaient le mélange de fantaisie et de sensualité dont j'avais besoin.⁴ Non, je n'ai jamais correspondu avec Rilke. J'ai lu tous les ouvrages de Rilke traduits en français; je ne sais pas l'allemand. Dans mon œuvre il y a un conte inspiré par Rilke (*La Pèlerine*, dans *Toujours l'inattendu arrive*).⁵ Non, la critique n'a pas remarqué le côté Rilkean de mon personnage.

The Austrian poet Riesenenthal in *La Pèlerine* is obviously Rilke.⁶ A cape which he had worn for some days has magic powers, conferring upon the wearer the gift of friendship and love. The owner of the garment who had seen an aloof, precise and sometimes bitter Frenchman, by this miracle, changed into a confiding friend, wins a wife by putting the cape around the shoulders of the girl he loves. This is the type of wistful story, with a supernatural element in it, that Rilke liked to tell. The dedication is significant: *A Jenny de Margerie*. Madame Roland de Margerie is well-known as a fervent admirer of Rilke's work. She owns a remarkable collection of Rilkeana which she showed me in Paris. She organized a Rilke exhibition in the *Bibliothèque Jacques Doucet* in December 1951.⁷

³ Rilke met Charles du Bos during his last stay in Paris. (January 8 to August 18, 1925). He visited him for the first time on January 29, and stayed from 4:30 to about seven o'clock. Charles du Bos, "Extraits de son journal" in *Rilke et la France* (Plon: Paris, 1942) pp. 207-214.

⁴ Claire in her diary: Double personnalité de Christian: le mage, évocateur d'ombres divines; l'étudiant cynique et libertin. Mais je l'aime tel qu'il est. *Terre Promise*, p. 251.

⁵ *Toujours l'inattendu arrive* (Editions de la Maison Française; New York, 1943) (Editions des Deux Rives: Paris, 1946).

⁶ Riesenenthal: Ri- for Rilke; -thal for Hofmannsthal?

⁷ Madame Roland de Margerie asked Léon-Paul Fargue to give her his impressions of Rilke. His delightfully rambling account "Souvenirs d'un Fantôme," A Madame Roland de Margerie, in *Rilke et la France*, pp. 217-222, contains, as M. Jean Cassou has told me, the best description of Rilke's outward appearance.

The poet Christian Ménétrier in *Terre Promise* is, just like Rilke, married to a sculptress, lives separated from her, and has one child, a daughter. Claire, the heroine of the book, becomes his second wife. He has written *Orphée*, described as *un livre important mais obscur*.⁸ Rilke wrote *Die Sonette an Orpheus* to which the same description may apply. Ménétrier seems to have Rilke's outward appearance.

Plutôt jeune . . . Maigre, ascétique, une tête de Greco; des mains admirables, fines et pathétiques.⁹

We recognize that Rilke is aimed at in the following passage:

. . . Ménétrier voyage beaucoup; peu d'écrivains ont attiré autant de correspondantes, de tous pays; plusieurs sont devenues ses amies, l'invitent chez elles, le traitent comme un magicien, ou comme un prêtre.¹⁰

A more malignant observer seems to have both Valéry and Rilke in mind:

Il est ébloui de l'éclat de sa propre obscurité . . .¹¹ Extrêmement adroit et même roublard, il a trouvé le moyen, tout en jouant le rôle de l'artiste pur qui ne fait aucune concession, d'atteindre un public relativement étendu et d'être soutenu par une douzaine de Mécènes femelles, semées de la Suède à l'Italie et de Bucarest à San Francisco . . .¹² Il méprise les succès d'argent, mais il s'arrange à merveille pour ne rien dépenser et pour être partout hébergé par quelque prêtresse pâmée. . . .¹³

A friendly critic, usually André Maurois' mouthpiece, seems to speak at first of Valéry:

Vous allez voir un de deux ou trois grands écrivains français de notre temps. Je suis convaincu que, dans trois cents ans, on lira certaines pages de Ménétrier comme on lit aujourd'hui Pascal. Il passe pour difficile; il n'est

⁸ T. P. 212.

⁹ T. P. 212.

¹⁰ T. P. 212.

¹¹ Une difficulté est une lumière, une difficulté insurmontable est un soleil!

Ce qui est simple est toujours faux. (Paul Valéry, *Mauvaises pensées et autres*.)

¹² Valéry saw in the poetry in our society *une infernale combinaison du sacerdoce et du négoce, de l'intime et de la publicité*. (*Fragments des Mémoires d'un Poème*).

¹³ P. 213.

que compact. On le tient surtout pour un poète; je trouve, moi, sa prose admirable.¹⁴

But then he seems to refer to Rilke:

L'homme? Je ne l'ai vu qu'une fois; j'ai été frappé par ses manières, qui sont exquises, et par sa simplicité . . . Avec les femmes, il passe pour être un peu comédien . . . Wanda Nedjadine, qui le connaît, m'a raconté qu'il prétend savoir, à distance, ce que fait ou pense la femme qu'il aime.¹⁵

Like Rilke, Ménétrier has a great liking for roses. Cutting the roses in his garden, before leaving Paris, he is injured by a thorn and an infection starts the blood disease which leads to his death. We recognize, of course, the poetic legend about Rilke's death. Leukemia is supposed to have developed from a similar injury when he cut roses in the garden of Muzot for a beautiful Egyptian lady, Madame Eloui Bey.¹⁶ It is indeed surprising that this similarity should not have been noticed by the critics.

CHARLES A. BENTLEY

Toronto, Canada

TWO ANTI-SEMITIC WORD PLAYS IN THE GUZMÁN DE ALFARACHE

In Mateo Alemán's *Guzmán de Alfarache* there are, among the many anecdotes based on themes current in the Golden Age, two stories in which the figure of the convert is exploited for its comic potentialities.¹ In one of the anecdotes, Alemán derides the Neo-Christian's traditional fear of the Inquisition, dwelling gleefully

¹⁴This is also the opinion of André Gide. See *Feuillets d'Automne* (Paris, 1949), p. 112.

¹⁵This is in keeping with Rilke's interest in psychic research; pp. 213-214.

¹⁶See *La Dernière Amitié de Rainer Maria Rilke*, Lettres inédites de Rilke à Madame Eloui Bey avec une étude par Edmond Jaloux (Paris, 1949), pp. 149-150.

¹No such stories can be found in Mateo Luján de Sayavedra's *Segunda parte de la vida del pícaro Guzmán de Alfarache*. Only in passing does this author scorn the Jews' expectation of the Messiah: ". . . y solemos decir por sólo no esperar no fuera judío. . . ." (Ángel Valbuena y Prat, ed., *La novela picaresca* [Madrid, 1946], p. 631.)

upon the plight of a prosperous *marrano* who ceases to enjoy life the moment when the High Inquisitor becomes his neighbor.² The second story, however, is more intricate, since its appreciation depends not so much upon the understanding of the incident itself, but upon the reader's ability to perceive the intentional ambiguity of certain phrases, a device in which Mateo Alemán excels.

The chapter in which this anti-Semitic anecdote appears is one of the more famous in the novel. The reader will recall that Guzmán, fearing an immediate attack by Don Lucas de Ribera, becomes very much upset by an innocent joke of the innkeeper. The author, in search of an image that will adequately portray his hero's emotional distress, has recourse to the following anecdote: "Cuando esto me decía, estaba yo de lo pasado y con lo presente tan confuso, que se me pudiera decir lo que a cierta señora hijadalgo notoria que, habiendo casado con un cristiano nuevo, por ser muy rico y ella pobre, viéndose preñada y afligida como primeriza, hablando con otra señora, su amiga, le dijo: 'En verdad que me hallo tal, que no sé lo que me diga. En mi vida me vide tan judía.' Entonces la otra señora con quien hablaba le respondió: 'No se maraville v. md., que trae el judío metido en el cuerpo.'"³

The textual meaning of the story is quite clear. The phrase "en mi vida me vide tan judía" means that the young *hijadalgo*, defiled by Jewish blood, now considers herself racially and socially disgraced (*tan judía*). Hence her friend's reply has the obvious meaning that, because the girl carries the son of a Jew (*trae el judío metido en el cuerpo*) her misgivings are more than justified.

A true appreciation of the double significance of this story hinges on a familiarity with the literary prejudices of the Golden Age. Although official repression had effectively removed the Jew from Spanish reality, the Spaniard still had very definite ideas concerning Jewish personality traits. The copious anti-Semitic literature of the period had created a Jewish stereotype, whose numerous defects included an absolute lack of courage. Many writers took pleasure in emphasizing Jewish cowardice: a story found in works both Spanish and Portuguese concerns the plight of the Jewry of Fez, mobilized against their will by the shereef for military service

² Samuel Gili y Gaya, ed., *Guzmán de Alfarache* (Madrid, 1946), v, 145.

³ *Op. cit.*; iv, 183.

in an hour of crisis. The mere sight of the large Jewish detachment is enough to rout the rebels, but the victorious auxiliaries, afraid of being manhandled by local youth on their return to Fez, demand the protection of a few "real" soldiers.⁴ Other authors voice the same idea without backing up their statements with reference to specific incidents. Cervantes, for example, derides the "... gente *afeminada*, infame y para poco,"⁵ and the terms *cobarde* or *afeminado* are frequent epithets associated with the Jew in literary works of the Golden Age. The equation *judío* and *cobarde* is so widely diffused that certain authors accept these terms as synonymous. A story by Luis de Pinedo illustrates this usage:

Siendo pequeño el Príncipe D. Felipe, corrían unos toros en la Corredera de Valladolid; y como arremetiese un toro tras un hombre frontero de la ventana do él estaba, hobo miedo y estremeciósse. La Emperatriz muy congojada dijo:—Por cierto que temo que este niño ha de ser cobarde. Respondió el Doctor Villalobos:—No tenga Vuestra Majestad miedo, que en verdad cuando yo era pequeño que *era el mayor judihuelo de la vida, y de cada cosa temia*, y ahora ya veis lo que hago, que no dejo nadie que no mate.⁶

⁴ Sebastián de Mesa, *Jornada de Africa por al rey don Sebastián* . . . (Barcelona, 1630), fol. 103r-v. The *Xarife*, fol. 103v, cannot fail to draw the pertinent conclusions: "Si mi enemigo supiera su valor, bien amparados estauamos. De aqui creereys, quã grãde engaño es pêsar, q̃ con la apariçieia exterior se podra extinguir la memoria q̃ ay destas gêtes."

This story is taken almost textually from Hieronimo de Mendoga, *Jornada de Africa* (Lisboa, 1785—the first edition was published in Lisbon, 1607). The Portuguese writer did not believe that cowardice was an inherently Jewish characteristic; he remembers "... o valor de sua antiga ousadia . . ." (p. 131)—apparently a reference to the Maccabees—and, strangely enough, attributes the loss of their moral stamina to the oppressive measures taken by Moorish overlords. He points out, p. 132, "... quanta differença faz esta gente em si mesmo em companhia de Christãos."

⁵ Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *Comedias y entremeses*, eds. Rodolfo Schevill and Adolfo Bonilla (Madrid, 1915), I, 285. The italics in this and all the following quotes are mine.

⁶ *Libro de chistes* (Buenos Aires, 1939), pp. 50-51. Piendo is obviously concerned with the double meaning of *judihuelo*—"a coward" and "a little Jewish boy"—, since elsewhere in the same work (p. 53) he derides the Jewish ancestry of doctor Villalobos. This physician is also the object of racial innuendos by Sebastián de Horozco, *Cancionero*, ed. Antonio Martín Gamero (Sevilla, 1874), p. 92: "Dende hoy aprenderés/otro oficio en que ganés/de comer, y no en la cura,/que ya por vra. ventura/tiempo de

And Luis Quiñones de Benavente has one of his characters say to an old man who tries to back out of a fight: "*Digo que es un judigüelo.*"⁷ In cases such as the ones quoted above the term *judío* or *judihuelo* does not designate primarily the racial origin of the person, but a human defect at its worst among Jews: cowardice.

Interpreting Alemán's remarks with knowledge of this traditional usage of the epithet *judío*, one may conclude that the phrase "en mi vida me vide tan Judía" means that the young woman is very much afraid of the danger and pains of childbirth. Instead of using a more conventional phrase such as "en mi vida he tenido más miedo," Alemán chooses an expression that allows him to make the most of a pun.

The friend's reply in Alemán's anecdote must now be related to the second meaning given to the phrase "verse judía." The expression "traer el judío metido en el cuerpo" and other very similar ones such as "tener el judío en el cuerpo" cannot have been too common even in Covarrubias's times, for the distinguished lexicographer feels compelled to explain their meaning: "Tener el judío en el cuerpo, estar con miedo; porque permitiéndolo Nuestro Señor vinieron a ser los judíos gente muy apocada y abatida, después de la muerte de Nuestro Redentor,"⁸ The term is used in the same sense by Sancho de Muñón to ridicule a typical braggart, terrified by the idea that he may have to face somebody capable of doing him harm:

Cel.[estina] Pasos oigo, acá suben, no sé quién es; ó amigo, ó enemigo, ó mal criado es, pues sube sin llamar.

Brum.[andilon] ¡Oh, por Dios, que lo segundo es; méteme en la camarilla de las hierbas, cierra, cierra presto con llave por defuera.

Cel. Zancadillas va dando el diablo azogado, el judío lleva en el cuerpo.⁹

xpianos es./" The racial origin of the Villalobos is discussed by Antonio María Fabié in his introduction to *Algunas obras del doctor Francisco López de Villalobos* (Madrid, 1886), pp. 1-9, and by Eduardo García del Real in a study preliminary to his edition of *El sumario de la medicina . . .* (Madrid, 1948), pp. 13-20.

⁷ *La Dueña* in *Colección de piezas dramáticas. Entremeses. Loas y jácaras*, ed. Cayetano Rosell (Madrid, 1872), I, 217.

⁸ *Tesoro de la lengua castellana o española según la impresión de 1611, con las adiciones de Benito Remigio Noydens publicadas en la de 1674*, ed. Martín de Riquer (Barcelona, 1943), p. 720.

⁹ *Tragicomedia de Lisandro y Roselia, llamada Elicia, y por otro nombre cuarta obra y tercera Celestina* (Madrid, 1872), p. 61.

And the ingenious satirist Francisco Manoel de Melo in a collection of witty *equivocos* says, playing with the meanings of *corpo*:

-Ora senhores meus, já o nosso gigante metaphorico tem cabeça: formemos-lhe *corpo* . . . mas receio que seja o *corpo* de palha; porque todas as metaphoras da mode, são uma palhada.

-Antes sairá gentil-homem, sendo o *corpo* d'odre; por serem os *equivocos* cousa de vento; e o dizel-os é flato, em que têm dado muitos.

-Quem ha de carregar com elle?

-Já eu estava com o judeu no *corpo*, receiando essa pergunta.¹⁰

Alemán, it may now be seen, put in the mouth of the clever friend an expression meaningful both in the literary sense ("traer el judío metido en el cuerpo"—to carry a Jewish child in her womb) and in the metaphorical sense of "being very much afraid," perhaps both of the imminent pains of giving birth to a partly Jewish child and of the resulting loss of social status.

The difficulties of interpreting this anecdote can best be appreciated by consulting the translations into French, English and Latin. Only one translator, James Mabbe, tried to carry over this play on words into another language,¹¹ and he has obviously stumbled over the difficulties of the tale. The English translator conscientiously consulted Covarrubias's dictionary, since in a marginal note he refers to the "proverbe" "Tener el Iudio en el cuerpo"—"To be in a great feare," giving as his source the exact page of the *Tesoro de la lengua castellana o española*. The same dictionary, however, offered him no help for the rendering of "verse tan judía" into English. His version is:

When I heard him tell me this, what with that was past, and what with this present gamball, I was so confounded therewith, that that might be said to me, which was to a Gentle-woman, that is well knowne, who hauing matcht her selfe with a new Christian, for that he was rich, and shee poore; who being with childe by him, and finding her selfe (it being the first that shee had gone withall) out of ease, and in much paine, talking with another Gentle-woman that was an acquaintance and friend of

¹⁰ *Feira dos anezins*, ed. Inocencio Francisco da Silva (Lisboa, 1875), p. 61.

¹¹ I have not been able to examine the German, Italian or Portuguese translations. Of the French translations I know only those by Gabriel Brémond and Le Sage both of which omit this passage. It has also been omitted in the translation by Caspar Ens, *Vitae humanae proscenium* . . . (Dantisci, 1652) and that by Edward Lowdell, *The amusing adventures of Gyzman of Alfaraque* (London, 1833).

hers; she said vnto her; In good faith, I finde my selfe so ill, that I know not what to say vnto it. *I was never in my life, in that Iewish taking.*¹² as I am now in. No marvell (said the other) *hauing a Iew within you; and bearing him about you (as you doe) in your bodie.*¹³

Although such an accomplished Hispanist as Mabbe failed to grasp all possible meanings of the story, it is certain that the contemporary Spanish reader must have savoured fully the ingenuity of Alemán's anecdote.

EDWARD GLASER

Harvard University

TREVREZENT AS PARZIVAL'S RIVAL?

Walter J. Schröder (a rather recent addition to the Schröders in Germanics) has presented us with a full length book and a supplementary monograph on Wolfram's *Parzival*.¹ His interest is largely confined to the working out of an ideational scheme that corresponds to the concrete action of the *Parzival* on a higher symbolic level. He detaches this scheme from Wolfram's poem or superimposes such a scheme upon the poem. In any case, his interest in the complicated action, in the vital interplay of the characters, and in the specifically poetic presentation, is incidental, even negligible. He subscribes to Hermann Schneider's statement that Wolfram is the first German poet "in den man sich mit zäher Ausdauer einlesen muss" (*Der Ritter*, 11), but by "sich einlesen" Schröder does not mean that imaginative empathy which seeks to reexperience the poet's creation in both its intricate multiplicity and its totality, but rather the ability to discern the skeleton

¹² Sir James Murray, *A new English dictionary*, ix (Oxford, 1919), Letter T, p. 50, defines "taking" as "... condition, situation, state, plight (in unfavourable sense) . . . and also a disturbed or agitated state of mind; excited condition, passion. . . ."

¹³ *The Rogve: or, The Life of Govzman de Alfarache* (Oxford, 1630), II, 217. For a brief discussion of Mabbe's translation see P. E. Russell, "English Seventeenth-Century Interpretations of Spanish Literature," *Atlante*, I (1953), 71-72.

¹ Walter Johannes Schröder, *Der Ritter zwischen Welt und Gott* (Weimar, 1952), pp. 286. Walter Johannes Schröder, *Der dichterische Plan des Parzivalromans* (Halle, 1953), pp. 76.

outline of the x-ray picture while ignoring all other aspects of the living organism. This is a rash approach, because the elaboration of the outline cannot proceed without frequent references to concrete detail. The symbolic scheme, by its nature, is imbedded in imagery. And if the imagery is evoked by short-cuts of inference rather than by meticulous acts of recollection aided by check and recheck, the concrete picture projected will often be found to be at variance with Wolfram's text. Schröder's memory often plays him false, and he is much too quick to draw unwarranted inferences from isolated textual passages or from no more than haphazard glances at such passages. Such faults should caution us against too enthusiastic an appraisal of studies that present a challenging new thesis in uncommonly lucid and effective language.

Schröder's inquiry is focused upon the nature of Wolfram's religion. This involves a far-reaching examination of the non-Christian features of Wolfram's Grail legend and of Wolfram's relation to the Church and to contemporary heretical movements in Western Christendom.

The central concern of Wolfram's poem, Schröder believes, is the mystery of the Grail rather than the career of Parzival (*Der Ritter*, 41). Despite its association with features that do not derive from the Church, the significance of the Grail is indubitably Christian (*Der Ritter*, 41). It is not only analogous to the eucharist, but it stands for the eucharist in terms of poetic symbol (*Der Ritter*, 54). The sacred cult has become depraved and corrupted through the neglect of its chief minister, who is both king and priest (*Der Ritter*, 156). The theme of the poem is therefore the restoration of the sacramental cult in its purity (*Der Ritter*, 41). Parzival is predestined by divine grace eventually to bring this about, after failing in his first attempt. The healing power resides in the question which Parzival should have asked. This question corresponds to the ritual pronouncement of the priest in the performance of the sacramental office, and Parzival, according to Schröder, is a lay priest. The feature of prime importance, Schröder insists, is the ritual character of the question, and this, he points out, involves a precisely verbalized formula. Even an unintentional slip of the tongue on the part of the officiating priest destroys the sacramental efficacy of the rite (*Der Ritter*, 53). But does this conform to the situation in *Parzival*? We recall that according to Trevrezent

Parzival should have asked *herre, wie stêt iuwer nôt?* (484, 27), but the redeeming words as actually uttered by Parzival are: *oeheim, waz wirret dir?* (795, 29). Schröder makes no mention of the two versions. On this point, certainly, the parallel with the sacrament does not hold.

In his way of visualizing the culminating scene Schröder's account is again sharply at variance with Wolfram's text. As Schröder pictures the scene, all the knights and virgins are solemnly assembled in the presence of the Grail, when Parzival asks the healing question.

So darf es nun wohl als gesichert gelten, daß der Fragevollzug des Gralkönigs inmitten feierlicher Versammlung aller Gralsritter und—Jungfrauen und in Gegenwart des Grals selbst den Charakter einer kultischen Handlung hat, *Der Ritter*, 52.

Contrast this with the utter absence of pomp and circumstance in Wolfram's account: Parzival and his half brother are first offered a cup of welcome by knights in the great hall. Then they are conducted to the suffering king (who is presumably in his chamber). Then after a speech by Anfortas, Parzival inquires as to the direction of the place (the Temple) where the Grail is housed. (It is obviously not visible). Then Parzival prostrates himself thrice in the direction indicated and pronounces the question (794, 1-795, 29).

The figure of Trevrezent, as interpreted by Schröder, leads to the heart of the controversial and to me wholly unacceptable aspect of his theory. Trevrezent, a "lay priest," orthodox in his doctrine but close to the Catharist heretics in his way of life, instructs Parzival in the proper relation of man to God. But Trevrezent is not only Parzival's teacher, he is also his competitor, Schröder tells us. He leads a life of austere asceticism in the hope of himself effecting by vicarious atonement the redemption of the debilitated cult of the Grail (i. e. the eucharist, i. e. the Church). It troubles Schröder to observe that Trevrezent's instructions to Parzival are at variance with his own way of life. Instead of persuading Parzival to abandon his knightly status and become a fellow hermit, Trevrezent merely counsels him to practice humility. Schröder has no difficulty in explaining this contradiction. Like all of Wolfram's major figures, he says, Trevrezent has a functional significance in the scheme of the action, but when, as happens, a character is given

a new functional assignment the unity of personality is sacrificed by Wolfram without qualms. Schröder finds this principle operative in the delineation of Gahmuret and of Herzeloide (*Der dichterische Plan*, 8; 14-15). (I register a most emphatic dissent). In the case of Trevrezent Schröder accounts for the discrepancy by his twofold function, first of teacher to the knight who, contrary to any surmise of Trevrezent's, is destined to achieve the restoration of the pure cult of the Grail, and second of competitor in this quest.²

Thus Parzival and Trevrezent are forced by Schröder into a relation of rivalry and opposition. Trevrezent and Parzival are seen by Schröder as representatives of two antithetical modes of piety. Trevrezent's form of piety is contemplative, lowly, ascetically moralistic (the approach to salvation by the law). Parzival's form of piety is active, knightly aristocratic, and pursues the way of salvation through mystical love (Gralsminne). The fact that Wolfram has Trevrezent fail whereas Parzival's strivings are ultimately crowned with success, clearly shows, Schröder would have it, which of the two types of piety is superior in Wolfram's scale of values. This is Schröder's way of bringing Wolfram into line with the movement of a mystical, emotional piety initiated by Bernhard of Clairvaux. In emphasizing this relation Schröder follows the distinguished precedent of Schwietering.

To pit Trevrezent and Parzival against each other in such fashion amounts, in my opinion, to a mischievous distortion of Wolfram's poem. Schröder represents Trevrezent as pinning his faith on ascetic works of supererogation. In order to do so, he takes a few lines out of context (480, 10 ff.) and suppresses or forgets the basic motivation of Trevrezent's conversion to a life of ascetic renunciation. How is it possible to ignore the fact that Trevrezent was guilty of the same sin as his brother, the forbidden pursuit of courtly Minne, and that Anfortas returning with the ghastly wound in his groin was for him a terrible object lesson of divine punishment he had equally deserved? Does he not tell Parzival about his clandestine exploits performed incognito in collusion with his brother? Has Schröder forgotten Trevrezent's

² Schröder's doctrinaire exposition of Trevrezent's double function leads him to conclude: "Es musste eine Spaltung seines Bewusstseins vorausgesetzt werden, wenn die Romanhandlung widerspruchsfrei bleiben sollte" (*Der Ritter*, 114).

account of how he met Parzival's father on one such occasion; how the manifest family resemblance made Gahmuret say: You are Herzeloide's brother; how he swore trick oaths (*manegen ungestabeten eit*, 498, 3) insistently denying the allegation; how he confessed his identity under seal of strictest secrecy? Is not his prime concern then, I ask, to do penance for his own sin? Why does he, Anfortas' legal successor, renounce his knightly status but because of his realization that he is equally unworthy to function as custodian of the Grail? When we read Trevrezent's long account of all the wonder cures that "we" tried in succession and in vain (481, 5 ff.); of "our" formal act of supplication before the Grail (483, 19) in response to which the writing appeared holding out contingent hope of a saviour's arrival; of how time dragged on after that in the vain application of palliatives (484, 13 ff.); of how Trevrezent finally retired to the wilderness (484, 19),—are we not compelled to attribute this last step to his conviction that he must cleanse the Grail company of his polluting presence? How then can we accept the notion of Trevrezent as a "competitor" in the task of effecting the stricken king's cure?³

Thus the whole case that Schröder builds up for Trevrezent as the exponent of a piety of works, contrasting with a superior piety of love, is without merit. In his zeal, moreover, to develop the

³ *Der dichterische Plan des Parzivalromans* repeats the same flagrant omission of any reference to Trevrezent's sin in a passage (34-35) that I quote in extenso because it is highly characteristic of Schröder's theory and method:

Die Gralsfamilie bedeutet die Sakramentsgemeinde. Der Blutszusammenhang (wie ihn die 'Wirklichkeit' der Romanschilderung darstellt) ist praedestinativ zu verstehen; Wolfram meint eine religiöse Ordnung, wo er eine natürliche Ordnung beschreibt. Parzival ist zwiefach vorherbestimmt: zum König (er hat den ritterlichen Sinn vom Vater) und zum Priester (durch die Mutter, von der er die *triuwe* erbte). 'Natur' (*art*) ist für Wolfram ein religiöser Begriff. Gott wirkt hier als der *schephaere*. Alle Personen der Gralsfamilie erhalten ihre religiöse Funktion nach dem Grade der Verwandtschaft mit dem Gralskönig. Je enger diese Verwandtschaft ist, um so näher stehen sie dem Gral. Daraus erklärt sich das wichtigste Motiv: die Gralsberufung Parzivals durch die auf dem Stein sichtbar werdende Inschrift. Denn Amfortas' Bruder, Trevrizen, der nach dem Geblütsrecht sein Nachfolger sein müsste, ist ungeeignet, da er ritterlichem Wesen entsagt hat und daher für das priesterlich-ritterliche Doppelamt untauglich ist. So tritt Parzival als der Sohn Herzeloyses, der Schwester des Amfortas, für ihn ein.

dichotomy Schröder completely distorts the purport of Trevrezent's famous recantation.⁴

This basic distortion of the figure of Trevrezent sets the tone for Schröder's whole inquiry into the question of the *Parzival's* relation to heresy. According to Schröder, Wolfram transforms Chrétien's hermit into a halfway Catharist Perfectus (*Der Ritter*, 118). In an earlier passage he speaks of Wolfram's taking up a position contrary to the Church by having a layman perform the act of confirmation and by failing, moreover, to attribute sacramental significance to it (*Der Ritter*, 61-62).

This and many other passages in Schröder's work, taken in isolation, seem to make out a strong case of heretical leanings on Wolfram's part and to relate him to the Catharist movement. Thus Wolfram allegedly depreciates the sacramental character of baptism by stressing the acquisition of genuine faith over against purely formal membership in the Church (*Der Ritter*, 61). Surely there is nothing unorthodox in this position, and Schröder's repeated claim that Parzival remains a heathen despite his baptism (*Der Ritter*, 62 etc.) is a mischievously ambiguous formulation. As to baptism, far from depreciating it, Wolfram frequently uses *der touf* as a synonym for the Christian faith, and he has a wealth of imagery that symbolically associates water, including tears, with the precious baptismal fluid. A reference to the *Parzival Word Index* should suffice to dispose of such allegations. As regards the sign of the cross, Schröder says of Wolfram: "Er weiss nichts

"Denn wenn Trevrizent seine im IX. Buche geäußerte Ansicht, Parzival habe noch Aussicht, den Gral zu gewinnen, obwohl er schon einmal von diesem abgewiesen sei, als Lüge bezeichnet (*ich louc* 798, 6) und zurücknimmt, so kann er Parzival unmöglich und zu keiner Zeit als künftigen Gralskönig angesehen haben." (*Der Ritter*, 114 f. footnote). The background of this quixotic misinterpretation of Trevrezent's "lie" is a distorted reading of P 489, 13-20. Schröder's view of the recantation (P 798, 1-8) would warrant the following paraphrase: "I lied to you with weasel words—pretending to believe that God would approve of your remaining a knight instead of becoming a hermit like myself—in order to deflect you from the right course and make sure that you would never gain the prize, which I myself coveted. But my treachery boomeranged, as the outcome has shown. I congratulate you as the winner and acknowledge my sin." Such a confession would show up Trevrezent as a mean sneak, treacherous and ambitious on his own behalf. No wonder that Schröder, to justify such views, has to make the sweeping claim that Wolfram's major figures lack any consistent personality!

oder will nichts wissen vom Kreuzeszeichen" (*Der Ritter*, 104; cf. 123). This is quite false. Did not Gurnemanz take young Parzival to mass and teach him *ophern unde segenen sich* (169, 19)? *Segenen* is, as everyone knows, the Latin *signare*, to make the sign of the cross. On Parzival's Good Friday encounter first with the Pilgrim and later with Trevrezent Christ's death on the cross is the fact that is set in significant relief.⁵ In the same context with the cross Schröder remarks that there is in the *Parzival* no trace of any cult of the Virgin (*Der Ritter*, 104), but when Herzeloide nurses her own child does she not justify this departure from aristocratic custom by the reflection, *die hoeste küneginne Jêsus ir brüste bôl* (113, 18-19)? This certainly does not smack of any lack of reverence for the Virgin on Wolfram's part. In another context when Parzival, on his first visit to the Grail Castle, being then weighted down by mortal sin, is unable to ask the question which would have restored the king to health, this fact is used to construe an affiliation on Wolfram's part with the heretical position of the Donatists according to which the efficacy of the sacrament is contingent on the personal worthiness of the officiating priest rather than upon the fact of his proper ordination (*Der Ritter*, 70). This is later qualified, in the light of Trevrezent's admonition to Parzival *du muost zen phaffen haben muot* (502, 7), as a Donatism of sentiment, not of doctrine (*Der Ritter*, 75, 76; 111).

If the matters just touched upon—baptism, the cross, the Virgin, Donatism—have given the impression that Wolfram was in sympathy with heretical practices if not with heretical doctrine, it must come as something of a surprise that Schröder is really at pains to clear Wolfram of charges of heretical leanings. He does not altogether escape contradicting himself. However, the course of the rather tortuous argument is emphatic in absolving Wolfram of any consciously heretical, let alone un-Christian, inclinations. Wolfram regarded himself as a perfectly loyal son of the Church. We must always think of Wolfram as a man of the 12th century and not of the 13th. In the 12th century many matters relating to doctrine and practice were still in a fluid state. The Lateran Council of 1215 largely put an end to this and led to a more precise conception of heresy (*Der Ritter*, 78). Schröder's development of this view is

⁵ Knights marked by the sign of the cross (crusaders) are mentioned 72, 13 as the recipients of Gahmuret's bounty.

in welcome contrast to many distorted, half-baked, even downright silly claims that have been circulated as regards Wolfram's alleged heresies. An extreme case of this kind, which Schröder doubtless knew without dignifying it by specific mention, is Otto Rahn's *Kreuzzug gegen den Gral* (1933).

In the supplementary monograph Schröder makes some extreme statements regarding the characters' lack of individuality. He speaks of "das Rollenmässige der Figuren, . . . das Unlebendige, Maskenhafte." He concedes Wolfram's success in relaxing this rigidity in some measure, but, he continues: "Gerade solche Versinnlichung widerspricht doch der zugrundeliegenden funktionalen Personenauffassung" (*Der dichterische Plan*, 36; cf. 68). If Schröder complains that it is easy to get the characters confused (*ibid.* 37), it is largely because he has been paying more attention to his ideological scheme than to Wolfram's text. Twice on one page he refers to König Lidamus (*ibid.* 32) when he means Vergulaht. One should think that the name of Lidamus were imbedded in the memory of every Wolfram scholar because it is tied in with the first abrupt mention of Kiot (*Lidamus / Kiôt in selbe nennet sus*). On the same page the context of the two trumped-up charges against Gawan requires us to read Vergulaht und Gramoflanz where Schröder writes "Vergulaht und Kingrimursel." How one can lump Gawan's little lady Obilot with her older sister by the designation "die beiden Backfische" (*ibid.* 37) is hard to understand. In connection with Gawan, the sequence of his three adventures—Obilot, Antikonie, Orgeluse—is accounted for on ideological grounds, as we would expect (*ibid.* 51), instead of by the simple fact that Chrétien presents them in the identical order.

There is a completely baffling passage concerning Parzival's alleged awareness of Ither as his kinsman when he slays him (*ibid.*, 45; cf. 18). Like many before him, Schröder speaks of the unseasonable snow that sets the scene for Parzival's trance as [der] "Schnee, der in die Frühlingspracht fällt" (*Der Ritter*, 40), when by Wolfram's reckoning it was separated from Eastertide by half a year. When Parzival meets him on Good Friday, Trevrezent figures out that *vünfthalp jâr und drî tage* (460, 22) have elapsed since Parzival stopped at his retreat (on the day after the snow).⁶

⁶ See my paper: "Die epischen Zeitverhältnisse in den Graldichtungen Crestiens und Wolframs," *PMLA*, 1938 (LIII), 917-950.

Schröder's comment on the improbable motivation of Parzival's encounter with Feirefiz in the absence of spectators (*Der dichterische Plan*, 28-29) shows that he missed the humorous purport of Wolfram's comment: It was their doing, not mine! (The fact that they were kings has nothing to do with it). This is not surprising, because Schröder's references to Wolfram's humor are scant and stereotyped (*Der Ritter*, 251; *Der dichterische Plan*, 70).

This brings to mind an amusing little observation for literary historians to ponder. Between Parzival's departure from Trevrezent (fifteen days after Good Friday) and Kundrie's second appearance summoning him to the Grail Castle (during the Pentecostal season), Parzival proves himself in three more knightly encounters ranged in a graded series of difficulty: his combat with his friend Gawan, his combat with Gramoflanz (who had never hitherto taken on fewer than two adversaries at a time), and his combat with the most illustrious hero of heathendom, his half-brother Feirefiz. It suits Schröder's ideological approach to read a symbolic significance into the combats with Gawan and Feirefiz. Accordingly he mentions only these two combats, omitting mention of Gramoflanz, in four separate passages of the monograph (*Der dichterische Plan*, 6, 10, 27, 45). There is only one belated and wholly cursory reference to the combat with Gramoflanz (*ibid.*, 49). Perhaps Schröder's substitution of a two-combat scheme for Wolfram's three-combat scheme becomes more understandable if we happen to know that the *Parzival* summary in Ehrismann's *Handbuch*, 1927 (*Blützeit. Erste Hälfte*, 228) omits mention of Parzival's combat with Gramoflanz by inadvertence. Curiously, Golther's *Gralbuch*, 1924 (p. 136) is guilty of the same oversight. The coincidence is disturbing, but the real surprise is yet to come. Bartsch, in his introduction to the *Parzival*, back in 1875, also mentions only Parzival's combats with Gawan and with Feirefiz, reading a symbolic meaning into both (xxxi). He not only fails to mention the combat with Gramoflanz, but he is confused to the point of saying that Parzival substitutes for Gawan in his encounter with his heathen half-brother. What does all this add up to? Bartsch, Golther, Ehrismann, Schröder, they all forget about one of the crucial episodes of the concluding portion of Wolfram's *Parzival*, an episode that involves some of the most elaborate and successful use of Wolfram's humor. Is there any escaping the inference that several of Bartsch's successors

thumbed their handbooks a little too zealously instead of dwelling on Wolfram's text?

To summarize: Scholars who have wrestled long and earnestly with the enigma of Wolfram will find a great deal in Schröder's studies to challenge old views and open up new perspectives. It is to be hoped that a further, much closer and more cautiously searching study of Wolfram's text will convince the author of the untenable character of his ideological approach. To put a book of this type into the hands of students who have only a superficial knowledge of Wolfram's text I would regard as a scholar's version of the sin against the Holy Ghost.

HERMANN J. WEIGAND

Yale University

REVIEWS

Isländisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, Fascicles 1 and 2. By ALEXANDER JÓHANNESSON. Pp. 480. Bern: A Francke Ag. Verlag, 1951, 1952.

An etymological dictionary of Icelandic including both the older and newer stages of the language has long been high on the list of desiderata both for the Germanist and the Indo-Europeanist in general. Until the appearance of Ferdinand Holthausen's *Vergleichendes und etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altwestnordischen* in 1948, the usual place of first resort for the history of an Icelandic word was Falk and Torp, *Norwegisches und Dänisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (1910) which might be supplemented by reference to Torp's *Nynorsk etymologisk ordbok* (1919) and Hellqvist's *Svensk etymologisk ordbok* (2nd ed. 1939). If these books failed to discuss the word in question, one continued the search (usually in vain) through all the other etymological dictionaries of the Germanic and Indo-European languages. Actually, however, Holthausen's book did not materially help the situation: all too frequently it proved a Mother Hubbard's cupboard—following from one cross reference to the other one found that all the shelves were bare, and, with a sigh, reached again for Falk and Torp.

This being the situation with regard to Icelandic etymology, great hopes were raised by the announcement by Francke of a new dictionary written by the professor of Germanic and Icelandic philology at the University of Reykjavik, a scholar who, by birth,

tradition and training, might be expected to bring such a work to a splendid conclusion. Few men, and certainly no foreigner, could have the knowledge requisite for such an undertaking. The task had to be done by a native Iclander. We (or at least I) had hoped for a work which would make easily accessible the history of the Icelandic vocabulary from ancient to modern times and which would place it as succinctly as possible, first, in its Scandinavian and, second, in its Germanic framework and, last of all, if pertinent, furnish the Indo-European background. Since such was and still is my judgment of the need of the scholarly world in the field, I am forced to look upon the present work with somewhat prejudiced eyes.

Professor Jóhannesson has chosen to arrange his material under roots, given for the most part in their Indo-European forms as extracted from Walde-Pokorny, *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der Indogermanischen Sprachen* (Leipzig, 1927 ff.). His reason for this procedure is explained and defended in the Vorbemerkung preceding page 1 of the first fascicle: "Die isländische Sprache hat etwa 57% von den 2200 indogermanischen Wurzeln, die in Walde-Pokornys Indg. Wörterbuch angeführt sind, bewahrt. Es erwies sich als zweckmässig, die indogermanischen Wurzeln zugrunde zu legen, und unter jeder Wurzel werden daher sämtliche isländischen zugehörigen Wörter angeführt. Auf diese Weise wurde eine Wiederholung der Vergleiche mit anderen Sprachen vermieden."

In other words, the author has written a comparative Indo-European dictionary giving precedence to the Icelandic materials in so far as such materials were representative of the Indo-European common vocabulary—a sort of Icelandic supplement to Walde-Pokorny, but with incorporation of much more Indo-European material than a mere supplement would have required. The result is that the book is hopeless for general use by the non-specialist until the promised alphabetic index of Icelandic words appears; and, even then, perhaps only the expert already well acquainted with the pitfalls of Walde-Pokorny will be able to make his way about with ease and security.

As for the treatment of his materials, only a most detailed and careful study of every single item under every single "root" would permit of a truly competent criticism. Unfortunately such a criticism would compete in length with the book itself for there is hardly a single entry that would not call for comment. I shall therefore limit myself chiefly to general statements and particular illustrations.

One of the general criticisms which I would make of the Indo-European etymologies in this book is their frequent great dubiousness, and, even if true, their lack of pertinence for the Icelandic word. A good example is the very first one. There the group of

Old Icelandic *eiskra* 'rage, howl,' Nícel. *ískra* 'whistle, shriek; hurt,' etc. is the first entry under the 'root' *ái-* which is defined as 'brennen, leuchten,' whence also with *sk*-formation is also derived the Balto-Slavic group of Lith. *aiškus* 'plain, clear.' This is semantically possible even though it gives one pause before going on. But here are connected further, likewise without semantic justification, as belonging to a "*r*-bildung," Av. *ayarə* 'day,' Grk. *ἄριστον* 'breakfast,' Icel. *ār* 'early,' etc. (the entire well-defined Germanic family of Goth. *air*, OE *ær*, OHG *ēr*, etc.). Thus we have two independent Icelandic words given as justifiably related, the one for 'rage' (and physical and mental overtones of 'rage') the other for 'early.' The common denominator for them being a mythical PIE root *ái-* 'burn' and 'shine.' Possible; but if true, is it pertinent to the history of the Icelandic (and Scandinavian) family of *eiskra*? Such speculations may have a place in a dictionary of Indo-European, such as Walde-Pokorny, but hardly in one of Icelandic, and certainly not as its chief emphasis. And let us go on: At the bottom of the same page (after the intercalation of *aíos-*) is given an extension of this Walde-Pokornian root in the form *ai-dh-* (but without noting its relationship to the preceding *ái-*) by means of which Icel. *ið* 'activity,' *iðka* 'work,' *iðinn* 'zealous,' etc. are related (along with the name of the goddess *Iðunn*) to Grk. *αἶθω* 'kindle, burn,' OE *ād*, OHG *eit* 'funeral pyre,' etc. Here also is placed Icel. *eldr* 'fire' and its group (as *aídh-l-o*, not as *ai-l-*, in spite of OE *élan* 'burn,' *æled* 'fire'). From here on the gamut is run through Nícel. *impra* 'recall to mind, refresh' to *eðla* 'lizard.' Apparently the only criterion for etymologizing is phonetic possibility, not semantic history or probability. Almost every grouping follows a similar pattern of confusion.

But that is not the worst: It is when the author deals with such "roots" as 1. *geu-* "biegen, krümmen, wölben" (pp. 306-14), *gen-* als basis für erweiterungen der bed. "zus(ammen)drücken, kneifen zus(ammen)gedrücktes, geballtes" (pp. 332-7), 3. *ger-* "drehen, winden" (pp. 347-54), or 1. *gel-* "ballen, gerundetes, kugeliges" (pp. 365-73), and the like, that he has no restraining semantic bonds whatsoever.

And not only are the semantics confusing but the phonology is sometimes dealt with quite liberally. For example, at the bottom of page 352, top of page 353, after the root form *gr-eu-* (which unites, of all things, Grk. *γρῦ* 'a little; black under the finger nail,' and Lat. *grūmus* 'heap of earth' with Icel. *krjála* impers. 'move, stir') we find also the following: sowie (mit anl. *g-* aus *gh-* mit ursprachlicher aspiration des *g*) *grúfa* vb. "sich vornüber beugen, auf der nase liegen," and more such. When is a "root" not a root but two roots?

As for matters of agreement in vowel gradation series, they are frequently passed over without notice. I choose a random example:

Under the root *kei-* 'lie' (definition mine) pp. 195 ff. from which, as is usual, words like *hjón* 'family,' *heimr* 'home; world,' etc., are derived, we find also *hýrr* 'friendly, gentle,' OE *hiere* 'good, soft,' MLG *hüre* 'pleasant,' MHG *gehiure* 'mild, comfortable,' and the like, all of which point clearly to a *u*-diphthong.

Frequently much space is devoted to the obvious. For example, note all the citations for 'eggwhite' (not only from Icelandic but from the other Germanic dialects) under the root *kveit-* (p. 259). That they are related to *hvíttr* 'white' would seem to need no demonstration. The real problem here, if one wants to look for one, is how the Germanic words for 'white' with their final "t" can be derived from the radical set up for Skt. *çveta-* 'white,' etc. This however passes unremarked.

Just one more, one that really has me puzzled: On page 422 (bottom) we find a root *g^uredh-* from which are derived *padða* 'frog' and its congeners, Eng. *pad* 'cushion,' etc., LG *padden* 'stride, step,' and the like. To which is added: Hiermit wird verglichen ags. *pæþþan* "durch oder über etwas gehen," ahd. *pfadōn* "gehen, schreiten," ags. *pæþ* "pfad, weg" (engl. *path*), afries. *path*.. (etc. the well-known much disputed Germanic group). The combination of words like 'frog' and 'path' is bad enough, but where does the root fit in? The only possible connection would be by a borrowing before the first Germanic consonant mutation from an IE language (Celtic, Greek, Italic dialect) where IE *g^u* > *b*. But that would take some explaining!

The work has in it a great deal of information about the Icelandic vocabulary which has hitherto been available only in Blöndal but, as I said above, it will be accessible only when the complete alphabetic index is available. Even then the disarray of the materials will make it difficult to use. It is a pity that the author did not take as a model of arrangement his predecessor, Falk and Torp, or, if he wanted to use Icelandic as a basis of Indo-European etymology, that etymological dictionary which is unexcelled for its kind in the Indo-European languages, Walde-Hofmann, *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg, 1930 ff.). If he had, the mass of really valuable comment on the Icelandic vocabulary might not have been lost in the plethora of dizzy speculation.

I feel it is unnecessary for me to continue, since the accumulation could give no better notion of the work before us than these random examples do. However I feel I must express my regret to the readers of this journal, to the publisher, and no less, to Professor Jóhannesson himself for feeling compelled to review his work in this fashion. But to do otherwise would be dishonest on my own part.

GEORGE S. LANE

University of North Carolina

The Triumph of the English Language. By RICHARD FOSTER JONES. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1953. Pp. xii + 340.

"A survey of opinions concerning the vernacular from the introduction of printing to the Restoration" must inevitably be, in large part, a history of vulgar errors. The history is none the worse for that. Linguistic myths have endured for centuries in noble isolation from mere facts; and whether mythical or not, doctrines of language have had a good deal to do, at least in England, with literature and politics, education and religion. Professor Jones has done, then, a job that was well worth doing: the most careful and extensive survey yet made of the ways in which Englishmen thought about English from 1476 to 1360. His reading in the primary sources has been enormous; his rich materials are clearly presented, with convenient summaries and transitions from chapter to chapter; and the broad outlines of the development which he traces, already moderately familiar, seem generally sound. No one who has worked in the field will underestimate a book which answers many important questions and stimulates its reader to ask others still unanswered.

The book, however, is not as good as it should have been. It would be impertinent to quibble about mechanical slips, which are almost unavoidable in a book that has been long in the making; but there are also a good many errors or defects in fact and interpretation, most of which a little more attention to modern scholarship would have prevented, and these blemishes somewhat impair the value of Jones's work.

Unsatisfactory handling of matters of fact may be illustrated from Chapter V, "The Misspelled Language," and Chapter VII, "The Ancient Language, Part I." In the discussion of spelling reform, both the classical and the more recent Continental backgrounds of the English movement are neglected, with the result that men like Sir Thomas Smith and John Baret are very superficially treated. Though Jones finds in Smith's activities "possible evidence of a relationship between the interest in Greek pronunciation and that in orthography," he misses the fairly conclusive evidence which he might have found in Baret; and he apparently attributes to Smith certain commonplaces, such as the doctrine of the "power of the letter," which had been current for centuries. In the chapter on the early Saxonists, on the other hand, it is the sixteenth-century development in England itself which is underestimated, so that, for example, the compilation of an Anglo-Saxon dictionary by Sir Simond D'Ewes (1602-1650) gets special mention, whereas the name of Laurence Nowell finds no place in Jones's index. The feeling grows on the reader that sometimes Jones quite mis-

places his emphasis, and the suspicion is not allayed by a comparison of Chapter V, in which Cheke's important controversy with Bishop Gardiner is mentioned but not investigated, with the tenth and final chapter, "The Useful Language," where a long discussion is devoted to George Snell, archdeacon of Chester.

Questionable interpretations may be attributable in part to the fact that Jones is more thoroughly at home in the history of ideas than in linguistics. He takes seriously the self-praise and extravagant claims of an early lexicographer like Edward Phillips (p. 276), and he repeats an error which modern lexicographers have tried manfully to prevent when he quotes F. W. Bateson: "'An analysis of 40 pages of the *Shorter Oxford Dictionary* has shown that of every 100 words in use before 1600, 39 were introduced between 1500 and 1600'" (Jones, p. 200, n. 71). A more serious misinterpretation, I suspect, is involved in Jones's explanation of sixteenth-century purism. He finds its causes in such forces as the desire to edify the unlearned, on whom strange words would be wasted, in the hostility to rhetoric, and, to some extent, in nationalism; but his own materials show that a theory of linguistic structure has very definitely to be reckoned with as well. At least one argument against the introduction of foreign words into English was that a language, although it might exist by convention and not by nature, had still its own peculiar structure and would suffer if that structure were distorted. To describe an argument of this sort simply as "nationalistic" is to obscure the basic ideas about language in general which must underlie all serious discussion of any particular language; and it might be fair to generalize and say that not only Jones's account of purism but his whole study would have been improved by a more direct and serious consideration of fundamental linguistic theories, old and new.

The final questions with which a reader of Jones's book is left are questions to which Jones did not attempt to give conclusive answers. Writing, as he says, "neither a history of the language nor a history of style," he does not explore in detail the relations between the history of English and the history of English thought *about* English, or between linguistic theory and the theory and practice of literature. Obviously, these relations were often complex and indirect. The language itself was only one determinant of opinions concerning it, and judgments of the medium were only one influence on the uses to which it was put. Nevertheless, significant relations did exist, and though adequate statements of them will be difficult, not the least of Professor Jones's valuable contributions should be the stimulation of further inquiry into these matters.

JAMES SLEDD

University of Chicago

Studies in the History of Old English Literature. By KENNETH SISAM. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953. Pp. vii + 314. \$6.00.

It is not easy within the space of several paragraphs to write a proper review of this important book, for Sisam has the gift of saying much in a few pages and the thirteen essays that make up this volume are independent of one another. They all treat some aspect of Old English, to be sure, and for the most part they deal with problems of textual transmission, but there is no continuity of the sort that is found in a book where one chapter leads on to the next. In fact, seven of these papers have already appeared in print, and I turn first to brief comments on them.

"Cynewulf and his Poetry," the 1933 Gollancz lecture, is a level-headed discussion of what is known about the early poet and an admirable illustration of Sisam's skill in synthesizing a large body of material. The other papers, which came out originally in *MLR* and *RES*, I take up in the order of their publication. In "The Beowulf Manuscript," a brief note on the different parts of Cotton MS. Vitellius A xv, Sisam points out the name of Nowell on the first page of *Beowulf*, a fact that had been unnoted by earlier students of the poem. "An Old English Translation of a Letter from Wynfrith to Eadburga" contains the text of the letter found in Cotton MS. Otho C i, a detailed description of the manuscript and a discussion of the origin of the translation. In "The Authenticity of Certain Texts in Lambard's *Archaionomia* 1568" several supposedly genuine Old English texts are shown to be Elizabethan Anglo-Saxon translations from the Latin. "MSS. Bodley 340 and 342: Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*" is a brilliant illustration of the harvest to be gathered from "the irregular study of Old English manuscripts," for, having discussed such matters as the place, date, and stages of copying of these important sermons, Sisam goes on to a consideration of the accent marks and marginalia that were added to the manuscripts in succeeding years and demonstrates that such philologists as Ellis, Trautmann, and Björkman were rather far from the mark in their study of the *Ormulum*: the accents and spellings in that work were designed for the practical purpose of aiding those who read the homilies aloud. "The Exeter Book" is an examination of the ways by which this anthology of poetry came to be made and a discussion of its uniqueness (alongside the three other great collections of Old English poetry) in the nature of its contents and in the consistency of certain of its linguistic features. In "The Authority of Old English Poetical Manuscripts" Sisam takes *Genesis B* 313-17, 327-29 as a point of departure and amasses evidence to show that Old English scribes were generally careless, thus raising questions of primary importance to textual critics and editors. The author is by no means an extremist who advocates

emendation at every turn; indeed, he constantly advises a painstaking study of the manuscript and the subsequent construction of a text based on good sense. But, he maintains, "to support a bad manuscript reading is in no way more meritorious than to support a bad conjecture, and so far from being safer, it is more insidious as a source of error."

I now consider the chapters that have hitherto been unprinted. The last one in the book is a lecture, "Hunfrid Wanley," read at Oxford in 1935, in which the life and activities of the great librarian, paleographer, and cataloguer of manuscripts are appreciatively reviewed. "Seasons of Fasting" consists of a series of useful comments on the textual tradition, the literary connections, the versification, and the interpretation of the poem discovered in Nowell's transcript twenty years ago, first edited in 1942, and since then singularly neglected. "The Compilation of the Beowulf Manuscript" is an illuminating discussion of the formation of this book, with particular attention given to the several stages by which its contents may have been brought together. Sisam suggests that "London itself is the kind of place in which the collection might have been formed," and he believes that the manuscript was "the undertaking of a community, not of an individual who made a copy for his own use" and that it obviously was not made "as a present for some great man." "Marginalia in the Vercelli Book" is further evidence of the value to be gained from a close study of manuscripts, for here Sisam shows the likelihood that this collection of prose and poetry was in Northern Italy before the end of the eleventh century and so refutes various theories as to the way by which the English book reached Vercelli. And to fill the vacuum which his arguments have created, he presents a conjecture of his own. "The Publication of Alfred's *Pastoral Care*" is an interesting account of the method whereby various manuscripts of this work were reproduced and a discussion of the way in which the preface was added. As is true of all these papers, Sisam goes into general matters: in this instance, the difficulty of getting close to Alfred's writing because of the lack of a critical text, "a refinement that has seldom touched Anglo-Saxon studies." Finally, in "Dialect Origins of the Earlier Old English Verse," the older views that now and again are repeated in textbooks are questioned by Sisam's demonstration of the geographical vagueness of Old English dialects and the inconclusiveness of tests based on such things as morphology and vocabulary. "While verse was a medium of vernacular literature," he declares, "it was produced in all the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms." And he thinks it probable that "there was a body of verse, anonymous and independent of local interest, which was the common stock for the entertainment or instruction of the English peoples" from which poets might well have drawn their models.

There are few aspects of Old English studies that Sisam fails to touch on, and to illustrate the point I now mention some of the comments made about *Beowulf*. That the author is aware of the significance of the monsters in the poem is apparent from the suggestion that *Liber de diversis monstis, anglice* would have been an appropriate title for the manuscript, but an unhappy effect of his failure to revise those papers that had earlier been published is the remark that the poem is structurally weak, a view that Tolkien successfully refuted in 1936. There are passing comments on such diverse matters as the padded versification of the poem, the landsman's point of view from which the sea-voyages are described, and the reference to Offa as indicative of Mercian influence. Sisam has most to say, however, on the topic of textual criticism, where his guiding principle is "meaning comes first and last." The carelessness of the scribe he finds illustrated in *camp* 1261, *finnel unhlitme* 1128-29, and the inconsistent spellings *Heregar* 467, *Heorogar* 61, and *Hiorogar* 2158; *gara(cyn)* 461 is a further example of this, and in his failure to refer to the emendations proposed by Malone (*Wulgara*) and Holthausen (*wigana*) Sisam reveals an admitted weakness, his failure to take account of recent scholarship. The reading *wundini* 1382, accepted by Klaeber in the second supplement to his third edition of the poem, is rejected by Sisam, for its retention "would require in this one place only, a suspension of the normalizing practice of scribes and minutely accurate unintelligent copying throughout the whole long chain of transmission." Grein's emendation *sel* 1854 he considers right, and the failure of recent editors to follow it is an unfortunate illustration of their extreme conservatism. The keeping of such irregular forms as *yrfeweardas* 2453, moreover, he considers "a nuisance to the reader," and the infrequency with which cruces are so designated by modern editors indicates that "comfortable conventions have become established, so that healthy doubts have been stilled."

It is unlikely that all the judgments set down in these pages will be accepted, but Sisam's comments are so suggestive and now and again so challenging that they cannot be casually disregarded by students of Old English. And to these fruits of forty years' study, it is to be hoped, Sisam will bring further harvests from the Scilly Isles and so continue to stimulate students of our early literature.

HENRY BOSLEY WOOLF

Louisiana State University

Humoristische Tendenzen in der englischen Dichtung des Mittelalters. By HEINZ REINHOLD. (Buchreihe der Anglia Ztschr. f. engl. Philol., Bd. iv). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1953. Pp. 161.

Dr. Reinhold's study is a useful analysis of the humor—whether somber or light-hearted, barbaric or refined, scornful or sympathetic—to be found in a considerable range of poems in Old and Middle English, with particular emphasis on *Beowulf*, Layamon's *Brut*, the alliterative *Morte Arthure*, *Juliana*, *Patience*, and *Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight*. Chaucer is specifically excluded from consideration. The introductory sections of the study comprise a brief analysis and attempted definition of humor and a description of the peculiar laughter of the Anglo-Saxons.

Dr. Reinhold finds six distinct varieties of humor represented in Old and Middle English verse: the scornful, the ironic, the fierce or grim, the macabre and indecent, the courtly, and the comedy of character and situation. In successive sections of his study, he defines these varieties and, through allusion, paraphrase, and quotation, demonstrates their presence in Old and Middle English verse. Although the arrangement of his material is not strictly chronological, the position of "courtly" humor late in his list allows him to demonstrate a progressive refinement and "softening" of English humor from Anglo-Saxon times down into the fourteenth century.

There is much here that is of value. Dr. Reinhold has isolated numerous passages in all of the works he treats which are genuinely humorous—no matter what one's conception of that extremely elusive quality. And one finishes a reading of the volume feeling that there is much more of a truly humorous nature than he had thought in Old and Middle English verse.

In so saying, however, one has suggested an important weakness inherent in such a study on such a subject. As the list of Dr. Reinhold's varieties of humor above will indicate, most of the humorous matter to be found in this verse is more akin to wit than to the usual conception of humor. As Dr. Reinhold frequently has occasion to point out, the Anglo-Saxon warrior is "humorous," for the most part, only when he is exulting over a fallen foe; it is only when we reach *Sir Gawayne and the Lady of the Castle* with her graceful badinage that we encounter the civilized and civilizing spirit which this reviewer, at any rate, regards as essential to humor. Dr. Reinhold, one feels, is aware of all this—it is no fault of his that so nearly all of the "humor" he encounters is "Hohn und Spott" or "Ironie" or "grimmige Humor" or "Makabre und unflätige Humor."

The bibliography of the study is marked by certain peculiarities. Of the exactly one hundred items contained in it, only fourteen are

dated 1933 or later. Moreover, of these fourteen, only eight are later than 1944. One is inclined to regard this slighting of the scholarship of the last generation as a reflection of the inadequacy of German libraries during Hitler's regime and after, rather than as an avoidable weakness in Dr. Reinhold's study.

The volume is attractively produced and contains no significant misprints.

R. H. LLEWELLYN

Temple University

Ninth Supplement to a Manual of the Writings in Middle English 1050-1400. Additions and Modifications to December, 1945, by BEATRICE DAW BROWN, ELEANOR K. HENINGHAM, and FRANCIS LEE UTLEY. New Haven, Connecticut: The Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1951. Pp. 1769-1938. \$4.00.

At this late date it is hardly necessary to describe the plan of Wells' *Manual* or to comment on its usefulness. After its first appearance in 1916 each three years saw the publication of a supplement bringing the work up to date and steadily complicating its use; for, through the *Seventh Supplement*, the reader had to consult the original book along with the seven indexes to the supplementary volumes in order to get the full benefit of this indispensable compendium of scholarship. However, with the publication of the *Eighth Supplement* in 1941, the last to be done by Wells, an index covering all eight supplements was added. Thus, with the appearance of the present volume, the student need consult only three indexes to make use of the entire work. It is entirely too much to hope that these nine parts and the 1916 manual might be revised, consolidated, brought up to date, and published as a single volume, but it would be less difficult and assuredly convenient to have the three indexes combined into a unified whole which would also include the necessary references to the Brown-Robbins *Index of Middle English Verse*. Since the authors have not included information supplied by the Index, the reader interested in poetic texts must also utilize it together with the several parts of the manual.

The *Ninth Supplement*, covering the period from July, 1941, to December, 1945, follows the pattern established by Wells. In a good many instances the summaries of current scholarship are somewhat more extended than are those in earlier parts of the work, one of the many advantages of having a team responsible for this sort of scholarly endeavor. A good idea of how effectively this is accomplished may be found in the discussion of *Piers Plow-*

man, where the attention is pretty well concentrated on the studies of Bennett, Huppé, and Gwynn devoted to the chronology of the texts and the brilliant essays by Chambers and Coghill—but it should be noted that all the items of much significance which are listed in the bibliography are at least mentioned in the text. Although the authors have preserved the original plan, chapter headings, et cetera, let us hope they at least regretted the necessity of including the comments on *Piers Plowman* in a chapter entitled "Works Dealing with Contemporary Conditions," as notoriously inept a category for this major poem as can be imagined.

The bibliographical notes (51 pages) of this supplement, like those of its predecessors, defy any kind of orderly and detailed analysis. Suffice it to state that a rapid check of the items devoted to Chaucer and *Piers Plowman* reveals that they are gratifyingly correct and complete. Although very naturally most of the bibliographical data belong to the period to which this supplement is specifically dedicated (1941-45), there are many titles stemming from the immediately preceding years and, in a number of instances, going much further back; e.g., an edition of *Against Breaking of Wedlock* in the *Retrospective Review* for 1854 and an article on the *Sawles Warde* in the 1889 volume of *Englische Studien*. A welcome addition to the general reference material is a new section headed "Studies of Other Aspects of the Period," which is, however, entirely too brief (9 items). Readers who need to be told of Painter's *French Chivalry* and McKeon's *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages* probably ought to be reminded of a good many other standard references as well.

The concluding paragraph of the preface dedicates this supplement to Wells "who provided us with the only *Grundriss* in English literature written in its own language, and who gave Middle English scholarship the best bibliography available in the whole field of English and American letters." Since this is the last of the supplements, let us hope that the time is not too far distant when an entirely new manual dedicated to the memory of John Edwin Wells will appear as a more imposing recognition of his magnificent labors.

THOMAS A. KIRBY

Louisiana State University

The Ballad of Sir Aldingar, its Origins and Analogues. By PAUL CHRISTOPHERSON. Oxford University Press, 1952.

Since F. J. Child furnished the scholarly notes to the various ballads in his *English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, more than fifty years ago, his efforts have been supplemented by remarkably few full length studies of individual ballads. When investigations

have been made, they have usually concerned ballads that have a very great popularity and that are to be found in a large number of versions. With these the historic-geographic method, or at least a modification of that method, can be applied with success. The Ballad of Sir Aldingar, on the other hand, has a very few versions and a method of study which would be applicable to Barbara Allen or Edward could not be successfully used to determine its history. Actually, only three British versions and fifteen Scandinavian are known. With a good many ballads, the student is helped by a study of the versions brought to America, but Sir Aldingar seems never to have been sung on this side of the water. Christopherson is therefore faced with the necessity of bringing other things than purely oral versions of the ballad to his aid.

It will be remembered that in the Ballad of Sir Aldingar a steward attempts to seduce the Queen. When she repulses him, he plans his revenge and lays a blind and lame leper in her bed. The king is convinced of her infidelity and she, on hearing the accusation, asks for a knight to fight on her behalf against Sir Aldingar, the steward. After a vain search for a champion, a little child is found who promises her that he will see that she is rescued. Just as she is to be executed, he rides up and eventually defeats Sir Aldingar, who confesses that his accusation was false.

The student finds here not only a ballad tradition but also a general tradition about accused queens and cruel punishments that are meted out to them. The investigation proceeds by bringing together all the historical sources and relates the various chroniclers with each other, showing rather clearly that an oral ballad must have influenced some of them. The very thorough treatment proceeds to consider the English romances on related themes, then the Scandinavian tradition, the history of all the names that occur in the ballad and finally, on the basis of all of this, attempts to trace the history of the ballad. The main line seems clear enough. Stories of this nature seem to have developed both in Germany and in Flanders and the English ballad seems to be based upon such traditions. The English ballad was taken on the one hand to Scotland and on the other to Norway. From Norway it spread to Denmark and to the Faroe Islands and Iceland. The material is handled so carefully that there seems no doubt in the reviewer's mind that Christopherson has proved his point. He next proceeds to consider the relation of these ballads to the whole of romance tradition and takes up one after another the various romance types that handle the accused queen. He is by no means repeating here the study by Margaret Schlauch in her treatment of Chaucer's Constance but adds a great deal from the special point of view of this ballad tradition.

An important feature of the book is the printing of all the versions, those in foreign language with a free English translation.

For a ballad with as few oral versions as this one has left, the multiple attack method used by Christopherson is the only one that can assure us of any accurate reconstruction of its history.

STITH THOMPSON

Indiana University

John Lydgate. Eine Kulturbild aus dem 15. Jahrhundert. (Buchreihe der Anglia: Zeitschrift für englische Philologie. 1. Band.) By WALTER F. SCHIRMER. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1952. Pp. xi + 255; 5 plates. DM 27.

The scope of Schirmer's valuable study of Lydgate may be indicated by a brief review of its contents, which fall into three main sections. Part One begins with an account of England at the time of Lydgate's birth and proceeds to a discussion of the poet's youth and of the monastery at Bury St. Edmunds. Chapter III is devoted to Henry IV and the political situation during his reign. The fourth and fifth chapters take up the Chaucer tradition in the early fifteenth century and Lydgate's earlier writings, including the *Temple of Glas* and the *Troy Book*. Four additional chapters round off the first part of the study: two on Henry V and his period and two on the poet. The latter include discussions of his relation to Thomas Chaucer, the *Siege of Thebes*, and Lydgate's meter and style. Part Two opens with a sketch of the political scene at the beginning of Henry IV's reign and a consideration of Lydgate's only prose work, *The Serpent of Division*. Seven additional chapters are devoted to Lydgate as prior at Hatfield, his satires, mummings, and didactic poetry, and the translation of Deguileville's *Pilgrimage of the Life of Man*, and to the regency for Henry VI, Lydgate's trip to Paris, Henry's coronation, and his celebrated visit at the age of twelve to Bury St. Edmunds (Christmas, 1433—April 23, 1434). The third and final portion of the book focuses almost entirely on Lydgate and his later work: the saints' lives, the religious lyrics, the many moralizing poems like "Death's Warning" and "This World Is Variable," the *Fall of Princes*, and the few poems of Lydgate's closing years. Three appendices provide valuable supplementary material on the poet's reputation, Lydgate scholarship, and the canon. The first two topics are dealt with briefly (three and two pages, respectively), but some sixteen pages treat the canon in considerable detail. The book is richly documented, but there is no bibliography, though the second *Exkurs* on Lydgate research and

criticism partially atones for this lack. The index is full but confined almost entirely to titles and proper names.

In a paper read at the 1950 International Conference of University Professors of English and later printed as "The Importance of the Fifteenth Century for the Study of the English Renaissance, with special reference to Lydgate" (*English Studies Today*, pp. 104-110), Schirmer concludes as follows:

I am afraid we cannot do justice to an age like the fifteenth century by looking at its poets from the height of either Chaucer or Shakespeare, but if my paper can show in Lydgate's *oeuvre* [sic] the work of a pioneer rather than of a drivelling monk, as Ritson called him, it means that a revaluation of the whole literary output of the fifteenth century is needed. It must be understood as seedtime and harvest, as a necessary link in the great tradition of English Literature.

John Lydgate. Ein Kulturbild aus dem 15. Jahrhundert is built on this thesis and is a significant step in the revaluation just mentioned. This important volume is the first really detailed account of Lydgate's career and of the poet's relationship to the much maligned and misunderstood fifteenth century. Since most of its potential readers are doubtless to be found in England and America, it is unfortunate that the book could not have appeared in English. Perhaps some hardy soul will soon remedy the situation and thereby assure Schirmer's perceptive study the wider reading it genuinely deserves. Not only literary specialists but students of cultural history generally will find this volume rewarding, and even Carlylians can learn much from this account of another Bury St. Edmunds monk, albeit he was no Abbot Samson.

THOMAS A. KIRBY

Louisiana State University

Chaucer. By RAYMOND PRESTON. London and New York: Sheed and Ward [1952]. Pp. xvi + 325. Seven plates. \$4.50.

If one were to imagine that each of the Canterbury pilgrims had written a book about Chaucer—say, at least the Clerk, the Prioress, and the modern equivalents of the Knight, the Merchant, and perhaps even the Wife of Bath—the present study suggests the Squire with his interest in music and his active imagination. The book is as fresh as is the month of May. Underneath the many matters touched upon and the easy manner of definitive observation is a framework little different from the old scheme of chapters on the minor poems and chapters on the *Canterbury Tales*. But the Squire does not offer a complete manual of information; he is talking about a hundred and one problems from a new angle, and a

good deal of the time he knows what he is talking about. He also includes useful pictures: an illumination taken from a manuscript of the *Roman de la Rose* is here reproduced in color for the frontispiece; excellent photographs have furnished plates to show the naves of Exeter and Canterbury and the Ely octagon and lantern; and a secular love song attributed to Guillaume de Machaut is here printed with words and music, as well as the *Alma Redemptoris Mater*.

For anybody who knows Chaucer scholarship evidence of learning will stick out all through the book including the index. But the Squire will never consent to be academic and he is persistently jaunty about the necessarily technical. It is pleasant to have anyone show so much control of his information that he can write like this: "The couplet, in Chaucer's English, is never sing-song, and never sings too operatically. It is the least opaque medium, in which everything is clearer (and *clerer*) than prose. . . . The couplet refracts all the world to those who will look" (p. 27). Or again, dealing in an interesting way with the poet's musical accomplishment he says: "It is no mere curiosity that the Clerk's *Envoy*, one of the most 'dramatic' episodes in all the comedy of the *Canterbury Tales*, has a musical form which was common in Provençal and unusual in English. . . ." (p. 20). But from time to time his information seems a little dubious, as if the Squire got tired of reading monographs and pondering over footnotes (the English are always vexed by the necessity), and he comes out with such astonishing remarks as the following: of the *Book of the Duchess*, "... upon the affection of John of Gaunt or the death of John of Gaunt's first wife, which are supposed to be commemorated by the poem" (p. 39)—in the light of the specific allusions at the end can we say "supposed"? Or again: "... but I believe we can say also that Chaucer's progress in handling the seven-line stanza is enough to make us doubt the very early date which Skeat proposed for the *Clerk's Tale*" (p. 27)—what of the evidence we now have through the material supplied by Mr. Severs and Mrs. Dempster? Or again, regarding that masterly line in the speech of young Troilus ("And further over now ayeynward yit"): "I cannot recall a line of Chaucer's with less *sense*" (p. 105)—here I may refer to a brilliant article in the *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, xvii (1918), 399 ff., for its understanding. Or again, regarding the *House of Fame*: "I hope this author was dissatisfied with his 'digest' of the *Aeneid*" (p. 41)—what of his use of the *Roman d'Eneas*?

There are times indeed when one may be somewhat alarmed at Mr. Preston's facile presentation of ideas, as when says of the *Envoy to Bukton* "... by the time this was written the *Canterbury Tales* were well under way" (p. 123)—by 1396 they certainly were! Of the order of the prologues of the *Legend of Good Women* he

writes: "And since the doctors disagree about them, everybody will turn leech but the one person who knows the answer. I confess I am of the company" (p. 116)—after Mr. Lowes's article in the Kittredge *Anniversary Papers* can he believe that any of the recent studies of Chaucer's sources have really upset the order as presented in Robinson's edition? On the *Roman de la Rose* (for example, p. 30) I think some mention should be made of "la scolastique courtoise," certainly if one even thinks of Dante at this point. On the *Troilus* I find his comment often illuminating, and he seems to hold quite soundly that, as Lawrence once said, Chaucer "tests" Courtly Love, although it would appear that Mr. Preston believes that the poet was not quite sure at times what he did think about it, but was learning as he watched the lovers at their fun ("The impression which Chaucer conveys is that there will be time for the judgement," p. 99). Mr. Preston's real meaning is clear, it seems to me, when he says, ". . . even a poet must be able at least to pretend not to know, in order to have the pleasure of finding out" (p. 56).

Of the many ways in which this study affords me enjoyment there is room here to mention only a few. The remarks prompted in the author, who obviously has an understanding of music, have special value in the discussion of rhythm and meter. The genuine originality of much that is said on many topics appears in the style: of the pilgrims, "Chaucer throws out conventional compliments to see whether they stick" (p. 153). On the idea of Constance as a symbol, in part, for a complimentary allusion to Constance of Castle (an idea I proposed in *Selections from Chaucer*, p. xvii, in 1921) he seems favorably disposed (p. 204, n. 2). I like what he says about the Knight's Tale ("Emily is a wisp of a heroine. Palamon is a cardboard knight; Arcite is occasionally vigorous but finally incredible" p. 187), but it is just a little overdone. We must not forget that some sort of liquid was flowing in Palamon's veins at his prayers and also earlier when he turned state's evidence. I am grateful when Mr. Preston says: ". . . it is an affront to a great comedian of Christendom to ask whether Chaucer really intended his *envoy* for the Clerk. The scribe's heading is not to be taken" (p. 255). Or again: "Walter Hilton is what Geoffrey Chaucer might have been, if he had been given to contemplation instead of literature and affairs . . ." (p. 292). Mr. Preston knows something about religion. With regard to the Prioress it is odd that he thought it worth while to quote Eileen Power's comments. I know of no professor here or abroad who has found the Prioress "a psychological study of thwarted maternal instinct" (unless this is a clumsy allusion to Kittredge's brief and inspired suggestion). As to her religion mention might be made of her story, and that is what Mr. Preston supplies. There is very little old stuff in this book, however; and while it is not a volume

to use as a handbook in the classroom, for the very reason that its author has not attempted to gather together in accessible form all the harvest from "olde felde," yet no one who cares about Chaucer should fail to read it. It makes several other popular essays look cheap.

HOWARD R. PATCH

Smith College

Chaucerian Essays. By GORDON HALL GEROULD. Princeton University Press, 1952. Pp. iv + 103. \$2.00.

This fine collection of essays includes observations on "Chaucer's Calendar of Saints," the Pardoner, the Wife of Bath and her story, the poet's fundamentally serious intent, and some of his possible limitations. A valuable paper on the "Social Status of Chaucer's Franklin" is here reprinted in revised form. For general wisdom and insight the book is to be quoted along with Mr. W. W. Lawrence's recent study, to which in certain details it offers supplementary material. On the other hand it clarifies other problems and suggests a corrective where its author has been "irked by current interpretations or the lack of them" (p. i). One turns with special interest to the chapter on the saints and there finds many points of importance, including a condemnation of "The notion that Chaucer was at best a Laodicean in religious feeling" (p. 3). In the chapter on dominant ideas of the Wife of Bath he says: "Chaucer could adapt the five-measure couplet to many ends. For the speech of the Wife of Bath he made it heavy-footed though with frequent sharp turns to indicate the play of her satiric wit. . . . It is notoriously difficult to describe the subtle variations of tempo and rhythm, but Chaucer has suggested Dame Alison's utterance so plainly that any moderately competent reading will make it heard for what it is" (pp. 76-77). Of the *Troilus* he says among other things, "it does not fall apart" (p. 91). On the subject of Chaucer's use of the element of pathos he makes an especially substantial contribution, noting that "the pathos is never sentimentalized, which is only to say that its emotional appeal is grounded in nature, and it is equally free from the falsities of melodrama" (p. 84).

With some of the author's interpretations it is just possible that readers will be less satisfied. For example, when the Pardoner at last admits that Christ's pardon is truly best, Mr. Gerould says: "These are words of truth and soberness, and puzzling words to be spoken by the Pardoner as he has revealed himself" (p. 70). But, I believe, this is the time when he manages most skilfully to seem holy and true, and thus prepares the way with insidious hypocrisy to offer some of his relics as genuine after all. The host,

however, is never taken in for a second. When the author says that Chaucer in his descriptions of gardens and forest glades "gives the reader no impression of something freshly seen, of beauties newly discovered" (p. 97), one may perhaps disagree, remembering the scene in the *Parlement* where we have the "welle-stremes" "that swymmen full of smale fishes lighte" with their red fins and scales "sylver bryghte." And the poet sometimes manages to show an impulse from the vernal wood even when he is borrowing detail from other poets. Furthermore in his similes, when he writes of the stars on a frosty night, or a "hoord of apples leyed in hey or heeth," one may feel something of discovery. Such questions, however, seldom arise in the book, which gives us new and interesting material on almost every page. There seems to be a slip (p. 4) in the reference to the "twenty-third canto" of the *Paradiso*, which apparently should be "thirty-third."

HOWARD R. PATCH

Smith College

Critics in the Audience of the London Theatres from Buckingham to Sheridan. By DANE FARNSWORTH SMITH, University of New Mexico Publications in Language and Literature, No. 12 (Albuquerque, 1953), 192 pp. \$1.50.

Professor Smith laments the lack of factual studies of "the triangular relationship between critical theory, creative effort, and public taste," and purports to supply one by his exposition of dramatists' creations of 'critic' characters in about forty plays from 1671 to 1779. He sets a two-fold target at which to shoot: aesthetic and sociological—and concludes that his study does not reveal the necessity for any sharp revision of the history of English drama in this age, but gives valuable insight into "the comprehension of universal laws of social psychology as they operate in every theatre, and into the inevitable misgivings, doubts, and apprehensions of every writer when his work is first submitted to the public for approbation."

The title is curiously misleading, for one expects to discover under it new evidence about actual people in box, pit, and gallery as they articulated their pleasure or displeasure in the 18th century theatre—evidence obtainable from letters, journals, diaries, and newspaper accounts. All the evidence summoned by the author, however, is twice removed from reality since it is composed of excerpts of passages which became conventional insertions in the plays to disarm the critics in the Pit by anticipating them on stage. The collection of excerpts is entertaining, and forms a valuable

selection of one aspect of dramatic convention. No doubt the convention is based on very real actions in the playhouse, as revealed by such documents as the Boswell papers and the Cross-Hopkins *Diaries*, but one would prefer a more descriptive title such as "Dramatists' Presentation on the Neo-Classical Stage of Critics in their Audiences."

One is also at some loss as to the particular group of readers Professor Smith has in mind—scholars of the period, as he suggests in his preface, or undergraduates coming at the material for the first time. The former scarcely need be reminded that Dr. Johnson was the greatest of all conversationalists (p. 32), that Macklin is one of the best known figures in the history of the stage (p. 77), that Goldsmith was a famous dramatist who is also a representative of the periodical critic of the second half of the 18th century (p. 174), nor need he be given a page of biography about George Colman (p. 128). One might question the author's bracketed information (p. 82) that Cross, in *A Lick at the Town*, was an actor. He had been and did fill in as such occasionally as late as the 1750's, but at the time and in this play was Garrick's prompter.

The pictures are excellent. The presentation of running comment between the excerpts is uneven and somewhat repetitious. But it is, perhaps, useful to have in one basket, so to speak, so many passages which reveal what the dramatists liked to satirize in their self-appointed critics in the audience.

GEO. WINCHESTER STONE, JR.

The George Washington University

Diderot and Descartes: A Study of Scientific Naturalism in the Enlightenment. By ARAM VARTANIAN. The History of Ideas Series, Number 6. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953. Pp. vi + 336. \$6.00.

Il s'agit beaucoup moins dans ce livre de l'influence de Descartes sur Diderot que de celle du cartésianisme sur la pensée philosophique et scientifique du XVIII^e siècle. Ces deux grands noms servent surtout de bornes à une enquête où figurent les écrits d'un grand nombre de penseurs dont beaucoup sont aujourd'hui oubliés. Descartes, qui a arraché le monopole de la réflexion philosophique aux spécialistes, Descartes, qui a insisté sur le but pratique que doit avoir cette réflexion, est bien l'ancêtre des "philosophes"; et la philosophie cartésienne, qui a effectué le divorce, d'une part entre l'âme et la matière, et, de l'autre, entre la théologie et la science, s'est insensiblement transformée, dès que sa métaphysique,

—la chiquenaude de Pascal,—fut caduque, en un naturalisme philosophique qui ne tarda pas à devenir intégralement matérialiste. C'est ce riche et aventureux mouvement de pensée que décrit, explique et commente M. Vartanian en l'illustrant de nombreux textes significatifs empruntés aux œuvres des multiples penseurs qui assurent sa continuité. Cette collection de citations est à elle seule une contribution très originale.

Chemin faisant, M. Vartanian corrige quelques idées reçues, notamment sur le rôle exagéré que l'on attribue communément à l'épicurisme gassendiste ou à l'empirisme baconien et newtonien dans l'élaboration et le développement de la pensée de Diderot et de son groupe. Le chapitre III, qui est consacré à cette mise au point, est pour cette raison l'un des plus remarquables du volume. Les divers arguments qu'il contient sont de valeur inégale; quelques-uns sont empruntés à l'étude de M. Herbert Dieckmann sur le rôle de Bacon dans l'élaboration des *Pensées sur l'interprétation de la nature* de Diderot; quelques autres apparaîtront sans doute faibles ou spécieux, tel celui (pp. 178 et ss.) qui voit dans la défiance de Diderot vis-à-vis des mathématiques une preuve paradoxale de fidélité à Descartes plutôt qu'à Bacon. Mais l'ensemble emporte la conviction et le chapitre se termine sur un excellent développement consacré au rôle de l'imagination dans la pensée de Descartes et de Diderot. Le chapitre IV, le plus attendu du livre, "From Cartesian mechanistic biology to the Man-Machine and evolutionary materialism," n'est peut-être pas le plus satisfaisant et révèle certain parti pris. Le passage de l'animal machine de Descartes à l'homme machine de La Mettrie est très bien montré, mais on ne peut s'empêcher de penser qu'un coup d'œil plus insistant sur les prédécesseurs de Descartes, et notamment sur quelques Anciens, aurait permis une appréciation plus nuancée de l'influence de la pensée cartésienne sur la biologie des Lumières. De la même manière on pourrait reprocher à M. Vartanian de voir (pp. 26-28) chez Descartes l'une des origines de la forme dialoguée qu'adoptèrent tant de "philosophes" après lui, alors que l'influence de Platon et de ses disciples italiens de la Renaissance est certainement la plus décisive. Mais ce ne sont là que des réticences de détail. Au reste, M. Vartanian a fort bien vu l'objection inhérente au fait que les penseurs du XVIII^e siècle dont il parle ont eux-mêmes allégué plus souvent Bacon, Newton ou Locke que Descartes. Certaines des raisons qu'il donne pour expliquer cette anomalie laisseront plus d'un lecteur perplexe, notamment celle-ci: "Diderot and his associates were reluctant to make Cartesianism openly a support for their opinions, since that would merely have embroiled them in futile polemics with their opponents about the valid sense of the designation" (p. 34).

Un très intéressant cinquième chapitre, qui tient lieu de con-

clusion, s'efforce de justifier les deux grands noms qui apparaissent dans le titre de l'ouvrage. Faute d'études spécialisées suffisantes, l'évaluation comparative des influences exercées par Descartes, Gassendi, Hobbes, Spinoza et Locke demeure nécessairement fragmentaire, quoique très suggestive et, dans l'ensemble, convaincante. Quant aux raisons pour lesquelles M. Vartanian a choisi Diderot de préférence à La Mettrie, Buffon, d'Holbach ou Maupertuis, elles n'apparaissent pas toujours rigoureusement pertinentes. En effet, dans l'ensemble de ce livre, il ne s'agit guère plus de Diderot que, par exemple, de La Mettrie ou de Buffon, mais la supériorité, ou plutôt l'avantage pratique de Diderot vient du fait que sa pensée est probablement la plus complexe, parce que la plus universellement accueillante, de son époque. Il y a de tout chez Diderot; de quoi faire de lui un matérialiste ou un sentimental, un marxiste ou un bourgeois; sa girouette a tourné à tous les vents, aussi bien à celui qui émanait du poêle de Descartes, qu'à celui qui soufflait de la caverne de Platon. On doit excuser M. Vartanian d'avoir un peu trop exclusivement insisté sur le premier, d'autant plus qu'il nous offre, dans le brillant développement que contiennent les dernières pages de son livre, une solution toute cartésienne à l'antinomie, quelquefois exagérée par les critiques, entre la raison qui mène Diderot au déterminisme et le cœur qui le mène à une morale des sentiments:

His naturalism did not propose a total interpretation of reality on the level of a metaphysics, but sought essentially to establish the autonomy of natural science in the investigation of the physical world. Once this is realized, there is no inconsistency. Beyond the reaches of a science of nature, Diderot was concerned with discovering and describing—as Descartes, too, had done—a moral liberty subjective to man in the midst of an objective determinism. Diderot's thought, in this respect, still has meaning for us. Having gotten over the verbal tyrannies promulgated by nineteenth-century squabbling between idealists and positivists, it is now possible to maintain that moral freedom and physical necessity are not antithetical concepts, but instead are complementary . . . (p. 316).

Du coup l'analogie entre les efforts de Diderot pour sauver la morale traditionnelle et les maximes de Descartes dans la troisième partie du *Discours de la méthode* saute aux yeux. Les choses ne sont, cependant, pas tout à fait aussi simples que cela, et M. Vartanian souligne bien dans son premier chapitre comment l'un des aspects les plus révolutionnaires de ce qu'il appelle "l'héritage cartésien" fut de montrer la possibilité de lier la morale à une méthode de découverte scientifique, et ainsi de laisser aux théologiens le simple soin de régler "the conduct of the after-life" (p. 18).

Bref la complexité des faits n'est pas, dans cet ouvrage, sacrifiée à la clarté de l'exposé. C'est dans un judicieux dosage de ces deux éléments que se reconnaît le bon historiographe des idées.

M. Vartanian, qui avait déjà signalé son érudition et les qualités de ses exposés interprétatifs par plusieurs articles sur la pensée du XVIII^e siècle, nous offre avec son *Diderot and Descartes* un ouvrage écrit avec précision et clarté sur un sujet important, bref une étude digne en tout point du *Journal of the History of Ideas* et de la collection dans laquelle il figure.

GEORGES MAY

Yale University

Castillo Solórzano and the Decline of the Spanish Novel. By PETER N. DUNN. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1952. Pp. xviii + 141. 25s.

With this study, an elaborated M. A. thesis, Mr. F. R. Leavis's influence invades Hispanic studies. Castillo Solórzano—an "escapist" writer of "best-sellers" in an "age of anxiety"—is submitted as a dreadful baroque precedent of what is happening to literature in England and America today. The "trends" are not exactly parallel, of course, and Mr. Dunn, a sensitive critic, is quick to point this out. But he does justify his choice of an unpromising subject by constant reference to present-day letters. Herein lies his thesis. My quotation marks reproduce the author's; this irritating habit is called for by his suspicion of critical jargon and clichés. All this is to the good in a discipline as yet unsure of its critical principles and method. Even a wrong approach may be better than the conventional life-and-work one. It is possible to disagree with the *Scrutiny* group without caring to deny the merit of their shock treatment.

Dunn, unfortunately, fails to follow his master's, and his own, precepts. He gives no close readings of texts. He peddles "influences" as indiscriminately as Menéndez y Pelayo. He subdivides the art organism according to traditional critical procedure, and is surprised to find that nothing fits; he repeatedly tells us that in Chapter A or Z he has treated, or will treat, what should logically follow next. This suggests a certain inexperience on Dunn's part, an inexperience that is not limited to the application of Leavis to Spanish literature.

He knows and understands the Spanish courtly *novela* and picaresque novel, the raw material of his study. He offers an acceptable interpretation of sociological trends in the early seventeenth century. But certain background information is largely lacking. How much better the work would have been if the author had had a better grasp of the Italian *novella*! In tracing the evolution of the *Decamerone* framework, for example, he jumps straight from Boccaccio to Gaspar Lucas Hidalgo (pp. 16-17).

And if he had been able to cite a few critical works in the Romance field he would have avoided a hasty summary of Cervantes's style (p. 64), he would not have been surprised to find sentimental Moors in his author (p. 111), and he would have realized that the *odi profanum vulgum* (p. 95) and filthy lucre (p. 97) are *topoi*, largely independent of historical circumstances. To say this is not to deny the relevance of the application of Tawney's thesis to the development of the picaresque novel; it is to question the evidence.

His neglect of previous bibliography may actually explain the great merit of Dunn's book: the independently thought-out judgments. Some of these are very sound: the *novela cortesana* is regarded as a Byzantine novel in miniature (p. 35); *costumbrismo* in the seventeenth-century novel is shown to be an irrelevance (p. xi); the concept of *sangre*—blood, high or low, will out—is presented as the dominant theme, not only of Castillo Solórzano, but of much baroque writing. The work should be recommended to Hispanists, not because it is good, but because it is different.

BRUCE W. WARDROPPER

The Johns Hopkins University

BRIEF MENTION

Der Ursprung des Mythosbegriffs in der modernen Bibelwissenschaft. By CHR. HARTLICH und W. SACHS. Tübingen: Mohr, 1952. Pp. 191. The discussion of the European theologians, especially those of Germany and Switzerland, has been focused for some time on the mythical elements of the Bible and the substance which could be salvaged even if the myths had to be given up. Two of Bultman's followers have undertaken a study of the concept of *Mythos* that concerns the literary historian and perhaps the historian of language. This book tries to show that the views which are generally held to derive from Herder were actually first propounded by the Göttingen philologist Heyne. It is regrettable that the authors did not enter into a discussion of the related terms of oral tradition, *Volksdichtung*, *Sage*, and the like, which became prominent in classical and Germanic philology around 1800, but the Germanist nevertheless owes them thanks for having brought to his attention the revolutionary views of Heyne.

HEINRICH MEYER

Muhlenberg College

The Octosyllabic Vie de Saint Denis. A Critical Edition by JAMES H. BALTZELL. Genève: Librairie E. Droz, 1953. Pp. 70. Dr. Baltzell edits for the first time this *Vie de Saint Denis*, composed early in the fifteenth century. He summarizes adequately the literature devoted to the historical Saint Denis, beheaded 1700 years ago, and to the legendary apostle of Paris, whom the hagiographers confused with Saint Denis the Areopagite. He discusses carefully the author, the scribe, and the versification of this version. He proves, by a comparative analysis, that the poem forms an abridgment of the extensive prose version composed about 1250. Baltzell will prepare an edition of the short dodecasyllabic liturgy, which contains twenty appeals to Saint Denis; so it is not amiss to point out that the linguistic treatment of this octosyllabic version is quite superficial.

He explains many phonetic phenomena, but he overlooks several moot problems such as his diplomatic transcription of *i* for the *j* of *je*, *jouste*, *jusques*, *esjouÿ*, *sejourné*, and the scribe's rhotacism of *surcesseur* 231, 252, *virtorieux* 503, 600 in contrast to *acevesque* 113, 134. Even though the single manuscript is respected paleographically, a few emendations remain debatable: *qui* in verse 162 should be replaced by *que*; *fort* 595 by *fois*; *enfist* 634 by *en fist*; *alveill* 660 by *a l'ueill*; *l'a mist* 864 by *la mist*. Verse 724 is not "a result of the scribe's carelessness"; *que* is understood in it. An acute accent is placed unnecessarily over the ending *-ee* of twenty words, but is lacking in *charité* 466.

Similarly, the space wasted on modern terms in the small glossary could be used for difficult terms: *mauvais art* 204 "fausseté," cf. Tobler-Lommatzsch, I 552; *car* 726 "que," Johns Hopkins Studies Rom. Lit. Lang., xiv (1939), p. 130; *desfait* 851 "défiguré," *Tristan de Béroul* 1157; *engin* 200 "ingéniosité"; *les* 819 "côté"; *mesel* 809 "lépreux"; *grant pose* 261 "il y a longtemps"; *pourveance* 729 "Providence," Godefroy, vi p. 324; *respiter* 652 "sauver"; *reveler* 411 "raviver," *Le Miracle de Théophile* 435; *signacle* 832 "signe," *Gui de Warewic* 11065; *ver* 15 "printemps"; *virtueus* 296 "miraculeux."

RAPHAEL LEVY

The University of Texas

Froissart: Voyage en Béarn. By A. H. DIVERRES. Manchester: University Press, 1953. Pp. xxx + 159. To make available a useful extract from the mass of material in Froissart's *Chronicles* presents the problem of finding a long, homogeneous passage typical of the whole composition. The present editor of this new addition to the French Classics series of the University of Manchester Press, in deciding upon the account of Froissart's voyage, made in the

autumn of 1388, to the court of Gaston Phoebus, Count of Foix, made a judicious choice. The determinant in the selection was the desire to present something representative of Froissart's mature art. The account chosen is not only self-contained, it is also an excellent illustration that Froissart's earlier method of oral documentation has become a conscious, artistic and stylistic form in its own right, with the narratives of Espan of Lion and of the Bascot of Mauléon. In the introductory remarks, the editor has shown a fine appreciation of the artistic effort of Froissart in the carefully and dramatically planned presentation of Gaston Phoebus, with the ever-increasing mystery covering the fate of his son. This portion of the *Chronicles*, however, contains no example of the battle scenes for which the author has been so commended.

The present edition is made from MS 865 of the Besançon Public Library, the oldest complete version, in contrast to the previous edition of Léon Mirot for the *Société de l'Histoire de France*, which reproduced Froissart's second version as contained in MS Bibl. Nat. fr. 2650. It is accompanied by a reproduction from the Besançon manuscript, clear notes, glossary, index of proper names, and two very helpful maps, the first relating to the exploits of the Bascot of Mauléon, the second, to Froissart's journey with Espan of Lion.

LIONEL J. FRIEDMAN

Indiana University

CORRESPONDENCE

THE "EPÍSTOLA A MATEO VÁZQUEZ": A DUBIOUS TEST OF AUTHENTICITY. Casaldueiro, in his study of Cervantes' drama,¹ has found occasion² to question the authenticity of the "Epístola a Mateo Vázquez," attributed to Cervantes.³ Certainly the somewhat mysterious circumstances attending the publication of the poem, and the elusiveness of the manuscript, arouse suspicion.⁴ Casaldueiro believes that his argument against authenticity will add further justification for the poem's rejection.

He observes that in Cervantes' early verse the word "real" is normally treated as bisyllabic; the examples he quotes support his contention, which is not here disputed. Having examined those lines of the *Epístola* which are included in *Los tratos de Argel*, he finds as follows: "La *Epístola* en los versos de *Los tratos* que no ofrecen variante tiene a real como bisílaba, pero en una variante la introduce con sínéresis: *Tratos*, 'Despierte en tu réal pecho coraje.' *Epístola*, 'Despierte en tu réal

¹ *Sentido y forma del teatro de Cervantes*, Madrid, 1951.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 238, n. 1.

³ For the text, see: Cervantes, *Comedias y entremeses*, ed. Schevill and Bonilla, VI (Madrid, 1922), 21-30.

⁴ Cf. Schevill and Bonilla, ed., *op. cit.*, pp. 30-31.

pecho el gran coraje."⁸ His argument (not developed) seems to be that the supposed forger copied Cervantes' lines, but introduced certain variants; one of them resulted in a line which, according to Cervantes' habits of versifying, would be of twelve syllables; therefore it is spurious.

Such an argument might convince, were Cervantes an impeccable prosodist. But such is not the case. A single Cervantine play, *La casa de los celos* (printed presumably from the autograph), provokes its editors, Schevill and Bonilla,⁹ to the following comments on prosody: "135-20. Sobra una sílaba"; "166-14. Faltan cuatro sílabas en este verso, según el sistema seguido por Cervantes en la composición"; "169-7. Faltan sílabas en este verso del terceto . . ."; "183-16. A causa de este verso, que debería aconsonantar con el segundo, queda imperfecta la quintilla"; "204-24. Falta un verso, aconsonantado con 'manifiesta,' para la redondilla"; "208-12. Sobra una sílaba"; "212-20. Sobra una sílaba, como no se suponga una sinalefa violentísima en el verso"; "219-14. Faltan dos versos en la octava."⁷

Given Cervantes' deficiencies as a versifier, it may well be argued that it was he who wrote the line of the *Epístola*, "despierte en tu real pecho el gran coraje," and that he corrected his prosodic error when revising the passage for inclusion in *Los tratos de Argel*.

Among those lines of the *Epístola* not found in *Los tratos de Argel* (i.e. among those allegedly spurious) occurs the following: "donde tuuo el real conoçimiento."⁸ The word "real" is here bisyllabic—in accordance with Cervantes' practice. The text of the *Epístola* itself refutes Casaldueño's argument. The poem may be, as the scholar believes, a fabrication, but other arguments must be adduced to substantiate the belief.

GEOFFREY STAGG

University of Nottingham

ISTOS YMPNOS LUDENDO COMPOSUIT. I am not quite convinced of Professor R. S. Loomis' interpretation (*MLN*, LXIX, 34) of the passage unearthed by him in a medieval manuscript, which deals with the composition of hymns by the Lincoln schoolmaster William Wheatley in 1316:

. . . quo anno in festo natali domini istos ymnos
ludendo composuit

"'Ludendo composuit' simply means that William composed the hymns for playing, perhaps on the organ, certainly on some instrument."

⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 238, n. 1.

⁹ Cervantes, *Comedias y entremeses*, I (Madrid, 1915), 133-234 (text), 364-72 (notes).

⁷ *Ed. cit.*, pp. 365-71, *passim*.

⁸ *Ed. cit.*, p. 24, vs. 12.

Two objections might be raised against this interpretation of *ludendo*, both valid, of course, only if we assume, on the evidence of the rest of the text quoted, that this was written in correct Latin:

1) As for the dative of the gerund *ludendo* used to express purpose (in Mr. Loomis' translation 'for playing') we find with Stolz-Schmalz, 5th ed, p. 598 in all periods of Latin only rare examples of what these grammarians call "dativus finalis" and every one of these serves to complete the meaning of the verb and may be interpreted now as indirect object (*auscultando operam dare*) now as dative of reference (*comminus pugnando deficiebant*)—that is to say, it was impossible for the dative of the gerund to add the idea of purpose to an already complete statement such as 'he composed hymns.' *Ad* + acc. of the gerund would have been the correct construction, also in late Latin (cf. Vulg. *ad sanandum eos*).

2) As to the meaning of *ludere*, this verb is not used, at least in classical Latin, for 'playing instruments,' the correct term being in this case *canere* (*tibiā, citharā, fidibus*), cf. Krebs-Schmalz, *Antibarbarus*. The dictionaries of medieval Latin of Souter, Du Cange and Habel give no indication of any such development of meaning.

If we interpret *ludendo* according to traditional grammar as a modal ablative of the gerund (identical in function with the present participle, Stolz-Schmalz, p. 681) modifying the subject, the sentence must become 'he, while *ludendo*, composed these hymns.' What meaning of *ludere* could make sense here? Obviously the one so often attested with the classics: 'to sport, play with; to practice as a pastime, amuse oneself with' (*illa ipsa ludens conjeci in communes locos*, Cic.), especially 'to compose music or song as a pastime or exercise': *Carmina qui lusi pastorum* (Verg.): *ludere quae vellem calamo permisit agresti* (*id.*); *quod tenerae cantent, lusit tua musa, puellae* (Ovid). It is true that *ludere* was used in antiquity more in reference to poetry in a light vein, to improvisations (epigrams, bucolic or bacchic poetry), cf. Forcellini, but the medieval author disregarding the connotations of whimsicality and fancifulness associated with the verb, may have taken this secondary meaning of *ludere* as a given term for 'poetic exercise' in general. Already Sidonius applies *ludere* to the sublime poem of the *Aeneid*: *Mantua quas acies pelagique pericula lusit* 'the battle-lines and the perils of the sea which were sung by Mantua' (= by Vergil), quoted by Curtius, *Europ. Lit. und lat. Mittellalter*, p. 278. And did not Saint Jerome write, with a further extension of the metaphor: *Tullius in Xenophontis Oeconomico lusit* (= 'se exercuit in interpretatione,' Forcellini)? Thus *ludendo composuit* means probably nothing more than 'he composed as a poetic exercise.'

LEO SPITZER

BOOKS RECEIVED

ENGLISH

Arthos, John.—On "A Mask Presented at Ludlow-Castle" by John Milton. *Ann Arbor*: Univ. of Michigan Press, 1954. Pp. ix + 86. \$2.00. (Univ. of Michigan Contributions in Modern Philology, 20.)

Boughner, Daniel C.—The Braggart in Renaissance Comedy: a Study in Comparative Drama from Aristophanes to Shakespeare. *Minneapolis*: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1954. Pp. ix + 328. \$5.00.

Butler, Peter.—Shelley's Idol of the Cave. *Edinburgh*: The University Press, 1954. Pp. vii + 228. 15 sh. (Edinburgh Univ. Publications, Language and Literature, 7.)

Clark, Harry H. (ed.).—Transitions in American Literary History. *Durham, N. C.*: Duke Univ. Press, 1953. Pp. xi + 479. \$6.00.

Falconer, A. F. (ed.).—The Percy Letters: The Correspondence of Thomas Percy and David Dalrymple, Lord Hailes. *Louisiana State Univ. Press*, 1954. Pp. xxvi + 186. \$4.00.

Fussell, Paul, Jr.—Theory of Prosody in Eighteenth-Century England. *New London, Conn.*: Connecticut College, 1954. Pp. x + 170. (Connecticut College Monographs, 5.)

Gelling, Margaret, and Stenton, D. M.—The Place-Names of Oxfordshire, Part II. *New York*: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1954. Pp. 245-517. \$5.50. (English Place-Name Society, 24.)

Goodman, Paul.—The Structure of Literature. *Chicago, Ill.*: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1954. Pp. 282. \$5.00.

Holzknicht, Karl J. (ed.).—Sixteenth-Century English Prose. *New York*: Harper, 1954. Pp. xvii + 616. \$6.00.

McClure, Norman E. (ed.).—Sixteenth-Century English Poetry. *New York*: Harper, 1954. Pp. x + 623. \$6.00.

McMullen, E. W., Jr.—English Topographic Terms in Florida, 1563-1874. *Gainesville*: Univ. of Florida Press, 1953. Pp. 227. \$5.50.

Nicoll, Allardyce (ed.).—Shakespeare Survey, 7. *New York*: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1954. Pp. vii + 168. \$3.75.

Olson, Elder.—The Poetry of Dylan

Thomas. *Chicago, Ill.*: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1954. Pp. 164. \$3.25.

Ramsay, Robert L.—The Place Names of Franklin County, Missouri. *Columbia, Mo.*: Univ. of Missouri Studies, 1954. Pp. 55. \$2.50. (Univ. of Missouri Studies, XXVI, 3.)

Schrt, Ernst T.—Vergebung und Gnade bei Shakespeare. *Stuttgart*: K. F. Koehler, 1952. Pp. 260.

Shakespeare, William.—Complete Works. Ed. C. J. Sisson. *London*: Odhams Press, n.d. Pp. lii + 1376. 25s.

Smart, Christopher.—Jubilat Agno. Ed. from the Original MS by W. H. Bond. *Cambridge, Mass.*: Harvard Univ. Press, 1954. Pp. 171. \$3.25.

Summers, Joseph H.—George Herbert, his Religion and Art. *Cambridge, Mass.*: Harvard Univ. Press, 1954. Pp. 247. \$4.25.

Trollope, Anthony.—The Two Heroines of Plumplington. *New York*: Oxford Univ. Press, 1954. Pp. 112. \$3.00.

Wallner, Björn.—An Exposition of "Qui Habitat" and "Bonum Est" in English. Ed. from the Mss. *Lund, Sweden*: Gleerup, 1954. Pp. lxxii + 121. (Lund Studies in English, 23.)

GERMAN

Humboldt, Wilhelm von.—Über Schiller und den Gang seiner Geistesentwicklung. Nachwort v. Theodor Heuss [Turmhahn-Bücherei 11/12]. *Marbach*: Schiller-Nationalmuseum, 1952. 62 pp. DM 2.-

Jørgensen, Peter.—Tysk Grammatik. Vol. I. *Kopenhagen*: G. Gads, 1953. xiii + 254 pp. kr. 21.-

Kosch, Wilhelm.—Deutsches Literatur-Lexikon. Biogr. u. bibliogr. Handbuch. 22. Lieferung. *Bern*: Francke, 1954. 2001-2096 pp. sFr. 8.40.

Schiller, Friedrich.—Über naive und sentimentalische Dichtung. M. e. Nachwort hrg. v. Ed. Spranger [Turmhahn-Bücherei 15/17]. *Marbach*: Schiller-Nationalmuseum, 1953. 164 pp. DM 3.-

Stockum, Th. C. van & Van Dam, J.—Geschichte der deutschen Literatur. Zweiter Band: Vom 18. Jh. bis zur Gegenwart. 2. Auflage. *Groningen*: J. B. Wolters, 1954. 356 pp. f. 11.90.

Strauss, David Friedrich.—Justinus Kerner. Zwei Lebensbilder, 1839 und 1862. Erläuterungen u. Nachwort v. H. Niethammer

[Turmhahn - Bücherei 13/14]. *Marbach*: Schiller - Nationalmuseum, 1953. 98 pp. DM 2.-

Toimituksia. — Testimonial in honor of Emil Öhmann ed. by the Finnish Academy of Science and Letters. [Annales Ser. B Vol. 84.] *Helsinki*: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia, 1954. 672 pp. fmk. 2000.

Wiessner, Edmund. — Vollständiges Wörterbuch zu Neidharts Liedern. *Leipzig*: S. Hirzel Verlag, 1954. xiv + 372 pp.

FRENCH

Corbière, Tristan. — Selections from *Les Amours Jaunes*. Tr. (into English Verse) C. F. MacIntyre. *Berkeley-Los Angeles*: Univ. of Calif. Press, 1954. Pp. x + 242. \$3.75.

Henry, Albert. — *Christomathie de la littérature en ancien français*. *Bern*: Francke, 1953. Vol. I: Pp. x + 350; Vol. II: Pp. 175.

Imbs, Paul. — *Le Subjonctif en Français moderne*. *Strasbourg*, 1953. Pp. 70.

Ledésert, R. P. L. et al. — *La France*. *Boston*: Heath [1954]. Pp. 288.

Lough, John (ed.). — *The Encyclopédie of Diderot and D'Alembert*. *Cambridge*: C. U. P., 1954. Pp. xvi + 226. \$3.00.

Suckling, Norman. — *Paul Valéry and the Civilized Mind*. *London*: Oxford Univ. Press, 1954. Pp. ix + 285. 25s.

Vernière, Paul. — *Spinoza et la pensée française avant la Révolution*. *Paris*: Presses Universitaires de France, 1954. 2 vols. with consecutive pagination: Pp. 770.

Zellmer, Ernst. — *Altfranzösisch go—Neufranzösisch ga: eine syntaktische Betrachtung*. *Frankfurt a. M.*: [offset], 1954. Pp. 23.

ITALIAN

Mattei, Rodolfo de. — *Labirinto romano*. *Firenze*: Vallecchi, 1954. Pp. 414.

Sganzini, Silvio. — *Vocabolario dei dialetti della Svizzera italiana: fascicolo 2*. *Lugano*: 1954. Pp. 41-88.

SPANISH

Molina, Tirso de. — *El burlador de Sevilla y convidado de piedra*. *Cambridge*: C. U. P. (Plain Texts), 1954. Pp. viii + 96. 75 cents.

SLAVIC

Parry, Milman, and Lord, A. B. (eds. and trans.). — *Serbo-croatian Heroic Songs*. *Cambridge, Mass and Belgrade*: The Harvard Univ. Press and The Serbian Academy of Sciences, 1953-4. Vol. I: pp. xvi + 497. \$12.50 (English translations); Vol. II: pp. xxxi + 448. \$7.50 (Slavic texts).

1954

pende

Porio:

1954

p. 770

-Nec

trach-

1954

omana

ialetti

egane:

Sevilla

U. P.

3. 78

is. and

Com

arvani

my d

+ 497

II: pp

1950

semi

orari

1950

770

-New

crack

1950

mama

saletti

ganc

Sevilla

U. P.

77

n. and

Can

Arvan

any o

4-40

ii: pp

PHILOSOPHICAL LIBRARY BOOKS

A DICTIONARY OF LINGUISTICS

by

MARIO A. PEI

Columbia University

and

FRANK GAYNOR

Contributing Editor, Britannica World Language Dictionary

THE DICTIONARY INCLUDES:

- a) the general run of traditional grammatical terms, even though they already appear in standard dictionaries and works of reference;
- b) the more frequently used terminology of the field of historical linguistics, as it is used in the manuals of the last century and a half;
- c) that portion of the terminology of modern descriptive linguistics concerning which there is some measure of agreement among its users;
- d) the names, affiliations, and very brief descriptions of the major languages and dialects of the world, both past and present.

IT IS EXPECTED that this work will serve a very useful practical purpose. Being the only one of its kind in the English language, it will be a handy work of reference for students and workers in the allied fields of grammar and language study, philology and historical linguistics, phonetics, phonemics and structural linguistics. Here for the first time, gathered in one handy volume, will be found definitions of terms which have heretofore appeared in scattered books and in the pages of many different linguistic periodicals.

THE TEACHER of modern or classical languages who has been puzzled by the use of certain terms occasionally appearing in the writings of the specialists will find here at least a partial interpretation of those terms. The philologist whose terminology was derived mainly from Leskien, Brugmann, Hirt, Meillet and Meyer-Lübke will be able to trace some of the usages of his descriptive colleagues, while the latter, who in their enthusiasm for a newly developed field have largely neglected the older works, will be able to refresh their memories. All will be aided by finding in a single volume brief scientific descriptions of little-known languages whose names keep appearing in the literature of the linguistic field.

\$6.00

PHILOSOPHICAL LIBRARY, Publishers

15 East 40th Street, Desk 273

New York 16, N. Y.

Special student bulk rate on 10 or more

Expedite shipment by prepayment

PROGRESSIVE GERMAN READERS

By MENO SPANN AND WERNER F. LEOPOLD

A new series of Graded
German Readers in the

HEATH-CHICAGO GERMAN SERIES

DOKTOR FAUST, Book Four

Just published

Earlier titles:

1. Der Gorilla
Goliath
2. Am Radio
3. Die Nibelungen

Book 5 in preparation

In about forty pages of text, the authors tell the story of the real Dr. Faust, a perfectly historical if somewhat shady character of the sixteenth century. Students will enjoy reading about the legends that sprang up about him after his death, and the use that Goethe made of these stories in his great drama. The carefully graded text has the sparkle and life of the earlier *Progressive German Readers*.



D. C. HEATH
and Company

SALES OFFICES: NEW YORK CHICAGO SAN FRANCISCO ATLANTA DALLAS
HOME OFFICE: BOSTON

Announcing the new line of **McKAY'S MODERN** **Foreign-Language** **DICTIONARIES**

These new, completely up-to-date dictionaries are the result of continued and careful research into the linguistic needs of today's student, business man, traveler and general reader. They are practical, geared to the requirements of today; obsolete and uncommon terms have been scrapped. They combine authority with legibility of type and handiness of format, and they are bound to stand years of use. In every way they are the best value in the foreign-language dictionary field.

NOW READY: German, \$2.50; Italian, \$3.50; Swedish, \$3.50;
Portuguese, \$3.00; Spanish, \$5.50.

*Examination copies sent on approval to
accredited teachers of languages. Write to*

DAVID McKAY COMPANY, INC. 55 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK 3